THE Pope's Supremacy ASSERTED,

From the Conſiderations of ſome

PROTESTANTS,

And the Practice of the

Primitive Church,

IN A

DIALOGUE

BETWEEN

A Church-Divine and a Seeker:

In Vindication of

NUBES TESTIUM.

With Allowance.

LONDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Moſt Excellent Majeſty, for His Houſhold and Chappel; And are ſold at his Printing-houſe on the Ditch-ſide in *Black-Fryers*. 1688.

To the Reader.

I *Here venture abroad with a* Reply; *but it being not after the* Modern way, *of calling my Adverſary* Madman, Fool, *or* Knave, *I can't tell how it may take. Nay, 'tis without all thoſe Recommendatory Devices of* Sancho Pancho, Amadis de Gâul *or the* Proteſtant Footman, *and has nothing to ſet it out, but* Downright Reaſon, Honeſt Senſe, *and a ſhort Conſideration of the* Primitive Ages *of the Church. So that 'tis like to be acceptable to none, but only ſuch as can be contented to learn* Truth, *without thoſe now ſo faſhionable Entertainments of* Railery *and* Romancing. *How many theſe may be, I can't tell; but if they are only* few *in number, for my part, I declare, I had rather ſpeak* ſober Reaſon, *tho' but with a* ſlender Congregation, *than to play the* Merry-Andrew *for the drawing of* Crowds. *My Writing is neither for* Intereſt, Preferment, *or* Applauſe; *'tis only for the Vindication of* Truth: *and if this can't be done* plauſibly, *without proſtituting all* Reaſon, Sobriety *and* Moderation, *in compliance with the* extravagant Appetites *of a* Diſtemper'd People, *it ſhall never be done by me. If the People are to be humour'd, and they are ſo* Palate-ſick, *that they find a* Guſt *in nothing but what is* Pickant; *if nothing will pleaſe 'em but* Ridiculing, Spiteful Jeering, *or* Irreligious Romancing, *I won'd e'en perſuade ſome body or other to make a* Play *ſuited to their perverſe Humor; 'tis likely the hopes of* ſo much a Sheet *would prevail upon ſome* Hungry Poet *or another to undertake it: but to think of making a* Controverſial Comedy, *or turning* Diſputes *into a* Farce, *for a Popular Entertainment: no, let 'em go to the* Stage, *and there beſtow their* Smiles *and their* Hums, *for I would not have the* Search into Religion *be turn'd into* Buffoonry *to court their Applauſes.*

But what if they'll believe no Man to have got the better of the Cauſe, but he that loads his Adverſary with the moſt Ignominious Titles; that inſults over his Folly, *pities his* Ignorance, *and makes his* Knavery *or* Forgery *the* Burden *of every Page? Is nothing to be done, in conſideration of their Weakneſs, for the gaining*

their Good Opinion? If the Modern Practice *taken up by ſome of late, were to be the Anſwer to this Doubt, 'twould be ſoon reſolv'd into the* Affirmative: *for I obſerve a ſort of Men, who pretend to be Undertakers for* Controverſie; *they appear abroad daily in Volumes, and their Buſineſs forſooth is to* Settle the Minds of the People, *and to* Diſcuſs the Weighty Points of Religion; *but come and conſult them, and what is to be learnt? One* Inſults *and* Huffs *an Adverſary with a Grace; Another* Jeers *and* Ridicules *Gravely; A Third* Reforms a Holy Life *into a* Romance; *A Fourth talks* Irreligiouſly *and* Prophanely, *&c. Thus every one, according to their ſeveral* Gifts, *endeavor to* promote Religion, *treating* Controverſie *in ſuch a* manner, *that if they go on improving, I fear, the greateſt Advantage within a while, will be to the* Atheiſt: *For the* Way *they have open'd to run* Popery *out of doors is ſo* wide, *that all* Chriſtianity *will eaſily follow after it. Thus they do under the* Pretext *of upholding the* Truth *of* Religion: *when, alas! Things are now come into that Channel, that the main Buſineſs do's not ſeem at preſent ſo much* Religion, *as the ſtrengthning a* Party: *And therefore, if you obſerve, the greateſt part of their Books that now appear, are not Penn'd with that* Charitable Spirit, *as if intended for* Inſtruction, *but ſuch Methods found out, as ſeem moſt proper to* vilifie Adverſaries, *and to diſaffect the People towards them. For my part, I am aſham'd to think of the Condition of* Controverſie *at preſent; which is come into a* Dreſs *ſo far from* Modeſt *and* Religious, *that I muſt e'en reſolve to let that Part, wherein I am concern'd, to appear* out of Faſhion. *I labor for nothing but the* Truth; *this I'll endeavor to ſhew plainly and ſoberly, and if I am run down with* vile Reproaches *of an* Inſulting Adverſary, *it ſhall be my* Triumph *to be* thus overcome. *The following Sheets I recommend to your ſerious Peruſal; the Subject is a Point of Moment, the Grounds and Reaſons of which I have endeavor'd to lay open, both from the Conſiderations of ſome* Proteſtants, *and the* Practice *of the* Primitive Church. *I am not conſcious of having wrong'd any one Author here cited; if there be any Miſtake, I am willing to hear of it, and ſhall be as ready to correct it: for I deſire to go no farther than Truth will carry me.*

THE

THE Pope's Supremacy ASSERTED.

First Dialogue.

Seeker. SIR, I am glad to see you. I have a long time desir'd to meet with a Man dextrous at dealing with the Pope: For what with reading some *Protestant* and *Papist* Books, the *Old Man* has got so far into my Head, and made such a Disturbance there, that if I have not the assistance of some skilful Hand to force him from those Quarters, I fear he'll soon work in his *Chair* after him, and begin to *Define*, to make *Bulls* and *Breves* there. However I'll not despair of Success, if you'll but take me in hand; for I hear a very good Character of your Skill, that you have no difficulty in making *Ignoramus's*, *Fools* and *Knaves* of his Champions the Priests; and that for knocking down the *Pope*, there's no body like you.

Divine. Well; and as long as I wear this Gown, I never question to make good all that you have heard of me. Come, tell me, where's your Scruple? I'll warrant you some *Popish Priest* has been tampering with you, and with a little Sophistry, has cast a Mist before your Eyes, that so he might afterwards lead you by the Nose, as their way is, Blindfold.

Seek. No, Sir, The Mist that at present is in my Brain, is chiefly a *Protestant Mist*; and the greatest part of the Dust

that is before my Eyes, was rais'd by *your Gowns*. 'Tis this at preſent you muſt remedy.

Div. Let me ſee it then quickly, what it is.

Seek. Why, Sir, from my Childhood I have been taught to hate the *Pope*, and have entertain'd at all times ſuch hard Notions of his Holineſs, that I could never think of him, but preſently all the frightful Idea's of *Monſter*, *Antichriſt*, the *Man of Sin*, the *Scarlet Whore*, the *Beaſt* in the *Apocalyps*, with all his *Heads* and *Horns*, came into my mind at the ſame time. But now of late having turn'd over ſome *Proteſtant* Writers, I diſcover him to be nothing but a *Biſhop*, a *Prelate*, acknowledg'd to be of great Power and Dignity amongſt Chriſtians. And this works ſo ſtrongly upon me, that I begin to ſuſpect my former Thoughts, as the bare Effects of Education and Prejudice, and to think, that if they are no better grounded, I am bound in reaſon to reform them.

Div. Soft and fair: 'tis time enough to think of that. In the mean time let's hear what theſe Authors are that have given you this Diſturbance.

Seek. The firſt that gave me ſome occaſion for my farther Enquiry, was a Sermon of the Biſhop of *Exeter*'s, Preach'd *Nov.* 5. 1678. before the Lords in *Weſtminſter-Abbey*: in which he ſhews an indifferency as to the truth of ſome Points, which I till then had judg'd as evident Falſhoods; in theſe words: *That* S. Peter *had ſome Precedency*, ſays he, *before the reſt of the Apoſtles, is a thing we ſhall not much quarrel about*; *That he was Biſhop of* Rome, *and the* Pope *his Succeſſor*; *That the Biſhops of* Rome *anciently had, and might ſtill be allow'd to have ſome Precedency before other Biſhops in the World, if that would content them, we need not much ſtand with them about it.* Theſe words, I did not read without a ſudden alarm to all the Powers of my Soul; and you may eaſily imagine it, if you but conſider, that till then I had admitted no other Character of him, but thoſe dreadful ones of *Monſter*, *Horror* and *Antichriſtianiſm*, as I now told you: and now of a ſudden, to find a *Proteſtant Prelate* thus ſhaping him into a *Man*, a *Chriſtian*, a *Biſhop*, and ſo inclin'd to allow him a *Precedency before other Biſhops*; That *anciently* he had this *Precedency*; That he is the *Succeſſor of S. Peter*, who was likewiſe *Biſhop of Rome*, and had ſome *Precedency*

dency before the rest of the Apostles: This put me into a Surprize, and I could not but wonder at these so unexpected Concessions. For what, says I, is it all come now to this, that this strange and frightful thing the *Pope*, is nothing but a *Bishop*, and of that Dignity too, that he may be allow'd a *Preeminence* before others, and to be S. *Peter*'s Successor, who, as I perceive now, was a *Pope* too himself? Why then certainly, if this *Leading Bishop* be *Antichrist*, what must all other inferior Bishops be, but so many little *Antichrists*?

Div. To see whither *Ignorance* will lead a Man! Why no body doubts of the *Pope*'s being a *Bishop*. But 'tis not this makes him *Antichrist*; but his Pretensions to an *Imaginary Supremacy*, his *Tyrannies*, his *Usurpations*, his obtruding upon the World *New Articles* of *Faith*, and exacting *New Terms* of *Communion*, &c. 'Tis upon these and such other Accounts, he has lost his Respect, and is fall'n in the Eyes of all good Christians, from that Degree of Honor possibly due anciently to his Predecessors, under all the Marks of Ignominy and Disgrace; and if some look upon him to be *Antichrist*, &c. 'tis what in some Consideration may be applicable to him.

Seek. But under favor, Sir, by what I have lately read upon this Subject, I understand *these Crimes* were never legally prov'd against him; but a *Greater* and more *Universal Authority* has appear'd in his Defence, and pronounc'd Sentence in favor of his *Prerogative*, than ever Condemn'd him, or brought him in Guilty. Nay, I find they were only *Inferior Bishops*, and but a few too, that ever determin'd this Matter against him, such as could never produce any *Authority* or *Commission* they had for the Hearing and Determining this Cause. And if such an *Illegal Uncommissionated* Authority without Precedent, be sufficient with you, for the making an *Antichrist* of so *Great a Prelate*, who had a *Precedency* before others; I don't see but some *other Bishops* must come in for *little Antichrists*, since I find the very same Crimes of *Usurpation*, *Tyranny*, obtruding *New Articles* of *Faith*, and imposing *New Terms* of *Communion*, &c. prov'd against them, which you charge upon the *Pope*. And if *Reforming* such *Errors* be justifiable in a *National Church*, in respect to the *Universal*, it must needs be as commendable in a *Part* of this *National Church*, to Reform themselves, without

requiring the Authority of the *Whole*; since 'tis evident now by your Practice, that 'tis not *Authority* capacitates or qualifies for the just Condemning of *Men* and their *Errors*; but the very seeing of Errors gives just Authority to the Discoverer for the Condemning them.

Div. I know some *Dissenters* from our Church throw this Scandal upon our *Bishops*; but 'tis a meer Pretext, only to justifie their Division without the Authority either of Scripture or Reason, and therefore is as vain as 'tis destructive to all true Christianity: But for the *Pope*, his *Supremacy* is *Groundless*, his *Authority Portentous*, *a meer Usurpation*, *that had neither Countenance nor Being during the First Five hundred Years after our Saviour*. And therefore *I challenge all the Romish Priests in* England, *to shew me but one Canon in the Code of the Universal Church*, *that do's constitute the Bishop of* Rome *Primate over the whole World*, *Head of the Catholic Church*, *and the Father and Doctor of all Christians*. This *Challenge* so Fair, so Plain, so Full, I leave to the Reverend Fathers Consideration, and in the mean time I take the liberty to *declare* and *assert* to their as well as to our People, that there *is no Law of the Catholic Church for the First Six hundred years*, *nor ever a Canon in the Code of the Laws of the Universal Church*, *that do's either constitute*, *or assert*, *or suppose the Bishop of* Rome *to be that Primate*, *Vicar*, *Head*, *Doctor*, *and Universal Pastor*, *which the Council of* Florence *says He is*: *and that the Council of* Florence *founding their Definition for the Pope's Supremacy upon the Acts and Canons of General Councils*, *were notoriously guilty either of Ignorance or of Forgery*.

Answ. to Nub. Test. 20, 21.

Ibid.

Seek. And if those who have since *Separated* from you, as you did before from the Church of *Rome*, should make the like *Challenge* to all the *Priests of the Church of England*, to shew so much as *One single Text* throughout the whole *Scripture*, one *Word* or *Command* of Christ or his Apostles, by which your *Bishops* are constituted, your *Archbishops* and *Primates*; and where they are appointed and Commission'd with *Power*, *Authority* and *Jurisdiction* over the *Presbyters* or *Ministry* of the Flock, according as is now established by your Canons, and practis'd in your Church: what Return would you make? Is there any one Text relating to this Subject, but what the

Dissenters

Diſſenters do as fairly interpret, as you do thoſe brought by the *Romaniſts*, in favor of S. *Peter's Prerogative?* What *Divine Authority* are they able to produce, to uphold the Privilege of the See of *Canterbury*, whereby that has Right to the *Patriarchat* of the whole Iſle, and the whole Clergy bound to ſubmit their Shoulders to the Rod of that Prelate, as to their Spiritual Head and Monarch? Is this found, or even founded on Scripture; or in the Code of the Univerſal Church, or any Canon for the firſt Six hundred Years? And if later *Canons* be brought to vindicate this *Primacy* of *Canterbury*, why may not the like ſuffice for that of *Rome?*

Div. A *National Church* has Power to Conſtitute its *Primacy* in what *See* it pleaſes within its own Dioceſes.

Seek. And has not the *Univerſal Church* a like Power in reſpect of it ſelf, as a *National Church* has for it ſelf? Since therefore *Canons* be ſufficient for the conſtituting a *Primate*: if the *Canons* of a *National Church* be enough for the ſetting up, and giving juſt Authority to a *National Primate*, ſo that all inferior Clergy are bound to ſubmit to him; I don't ſee, but the *Canons* of the *Univerſal Church*, are ſufficient for the conſtituting a *Univerſal Primate*; and this at whatſoever time thoſe *Canons* are made; ſince the *Canons* receive not their *Power* and *Authentication* from the *Time*, in which they are made, but from the *Authority* that appoints, ordains and publiſhes them. And therefore if the Council of *Florence* was but a *General Council*, the *Canons*, there agreed to, are of the ſame force, as if conſtituted within the *Firſt Six hundred Years*: becauſe the *Church of Chriſt*, or the *Univerſal Church* is the ſame, I preſume, in all Ages; and the *Laws* enacted by her, at whatſoever time, are of equal *Authority* and *Force*, as the *Laws* eſtabliſh'd by our *Parliaments* at this time, are alike Obligatory with thoſe, that were made in the Reign of *William* the Conqueror.

Div. This is not to our purpoſe: for we are not now enquiring, whether the Biſhop of *Rome* was declar'd *Head of the Church* in the Council of *Florence*, for that we don't deny; but *We aſſert* and *declare*, that this *Decree* of this Council was an *Innovation*, and a thing not ſo much as ſuppos'd in any *Canon* or *Law* of the Catholic Church for the firſt *Six Centuries.*

Seek.

Seek. This looks to me all *Paradox*: For 'tis an Abſurdity to term any *Law* an *Innovation*, which is Conſented to and Enacted by that *Authority*, in which is lodg'd the Supreme *Legiſlative Power*. But however, ſince you lay the whole weight of your Argument upon the *Antiquity* of the thing, and Challenge to the *Firſt Six hundred Years*, I'll go back with you, and ſee whether thoſe former Times were ſuch Strangers to the Contents of this Decree, as you boaſt. I don't know yet what the *Romiſh Prieſts* may produce in Anſwer to your Challenge; but, as far as I perceive, whoſoever has read our own *Proteſtant Books*, need not look much farther for an Anſwer. And therefore to be ſhort with you, hear what *Montague*, not long ſince Biſhop of *Chicheſter*, ſays upon this Subject. *Antid. p.* 57.

What each ſingle Biſhop was heretofore in his Dioceſe, the ſame were Metropolitans in their Provinces, and Patriarchs in reſpect of the World: and 'twas rightly (who denies it?) ordain'd and provided by the Canons of the Primitive Church, that the Biſhop of Rome, *the Firſt (which no body denies) of Biſhops, who had ſo many Suffragans depending on him throughout the Weſt, ſhould, being ask'd, give his Opinion, as often as any thing was debated, relating to the Faith of the Univerſal Church, or to its common Diſcipline in which all were concern'd: and that whatſoever was to be eſtabliſh'd, He ſhould Ratifie with his Approbation, before it was Authentic, and had the force and efficacy of a Law throughout the Univerſal Church.*

Methinks this do's not well agree with what you pretend in your *Challenge:* for what *you* there ſuppoſe as *Falſe*, this *Prelate* aſſerts as *True*; whilſt he confeſſes, that the Biſhop of *Rome* was *ſuppos'd*, and even Conſtituted with an *Authority* over the *Univerſal Church* of Chriſt, by the *Canons* of the *Primitive Church*, which you ſay was never heard of before the Council of *Florence*, held but of late years.

Div. No, this falls ſhort of the Decree of *Florence*, which Conſtitutes the Biſhop of *Rome*, *Primate*, *Head*, *Doctor*, and *Univerſal Paſtor of all Chriſtians*. This is a *Portentous Authority*, unknown to the Primitive Times.

Seek. I ſee no difference: For as he that ſays, That no Determination of Parliament ſhall paſs into a *Law* Obligatory on the

the whole Nation, but that which is *Approv'd*, *Ratifi'd* and *Sign'd* by the *King*, do's in this very Act (abſtracting from all other Right) ſuppoſe the King as *Supreme*, not only in *Order*, but *Authority* too, as likewiſe *Head* and *Governor* of the Nation: So certainly it muſt be in our Caſe; and this is what the Council of *Florence* Declares and Determines concerning the *Pope*. But that there be no place for Scruple left here, Biſhop *Montague* farther enlarges himſelf upon this Particular, aſſerting, *ib. p.* 116. that *It is a certain Truth, that upon the account of a Common Union amongſt Chriſtians, and a Precedency of Order amongſt the Patriarchs, that the Care of the Univerſal Church was committed to the Chair of Peter.* In which words he ſeems to own all that *Authority* and *Prerogative* to have been always in the Biſhop of *Rome*, which this Decree of *Florence* declares to belong to him. For what is it to be *Primate*, *Head*, *Doctor*, and *Univerſal Paſtor of all Chriſtians*, but to have the Care of the *Univerſal Church* committed to him? If he that has the Charge of a *Dioceſe* under his Care, be *Paſtor*, *Head*, *Doctor* and Biſhop of that *Dioceſe*: If he that has the like Charge over *ſeveral Dioceſes*, or all within a Kingdom, be *Primate*, *Head*, *Doctor*, and *Common Paſtor* of all thoſe Dioceſes, and the whole Kingdom: If he that has the ſame Charge over ſeveral Provinces, be a *Patriarch*, *Paſtor*, *Head*, and *Doctor* of all thoſe Provinces: Then certainly He that has the *Care and Charge of the Univerſal Church committed to him, muſt be Primate, Head, Doctor, and Univerſal Paſtor of the whole Church*, as the Council of *Florence* ſays *He is*. Which is juſt the contrary to what you ſo ſolemnly *declare* and *aſſert*.

Div. If any *Proteſtants* confeſs, that what the *Papiſts* now profeſs in this Point, was according to the *Canons* of the Primitive Church, they are miſtaken.

Seek. This is *modeſtly* ſaid however, and is the very Reply made to the *Appendix* of *Nubes Teſtium*, where many eminent *Proteſtants* having been produc'd, as owning the *Primitive Fathers* to have been Favourers and Abetters of ſeveral *Popiſh Doctrins*, the *Anſwerer* ſays, all that is *not worth Conſidering*; if any *Proteſtants* did own this, *They were miſtaken. Concluſ. pag.* 86. which, I tell you by the way, was a very Tender Expreſſion, conſidering that Man's Temper, and I look upon as a Comple-

Complement to the *Proteſtant* Religion; for if they had been *Papiſts*, they had not eſcap'd without a Clap of Thunder: for this I obſerve in him, that he ſeldom lets them paſs without a Peal of *Hard Words*, of a *Great Cheat*, an *Egregious Cheat*, *Great Ignorance*, *Notorious Diſingenuity*, *Notorious Forgery*; which he lets fly at *F. Sabran* in a very few Lines. *Notoriouſly Guilty either of Ignorance or of Forgery*, is the Complement he gives the whole *General Council of Florence*. For Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney* he can't find Terms bad enough. And for the *Repreſenter*, *Ignorance*, *Malice*, *Knavery*, &c. are the beſt Titles he can give him.

Div. Well, but he do's not ſay all this without evident Proof of the Charge: 'tis nothing but fitting he ſhould let them know their own.

Seek. Then I ſee you are of the ſame Spirit. But if you'll know my Opinion, I do'nt think this *Grim Divinity* to be the propereſt Method for making Converts; me-thinks *Reaſon* ſhould go farther with Chriſtians than *Hard Words*: and for my part, I cannot but ſuſpect that Man's Religion, who overthrows all Principles of *Morality*, whilſt he's contending to ſhew himſelf the *better Chriſtian*. If you would prevail upon ſober Men, and make them ſenſible, on which ſide Truth lies, the Method of S. *Paul*, *Let your Moderation be known unto all Men*, is likely to meet with moſt ſucceſs: but as for this *Reviling* and *Abuſive Language*, 'tis proper enough to inſpire the Reader with *Paſſion* and *Fury*; and ſhall certainly inflame Men into a *Faction*, but never make a *good Chriſtian*. 'Twas the obſervation of the now mention'd Biſhop *Montague*, that *The Debating of Controverſies has fill'd us with Animoſities and Hatred: and the Divines are grown Furious to that degree, that being fill'd with a raging Zeal, they cannot endure the Converſation of any, that are not as mad as they*. And what edifying in all this? Is the Reader become the *ſounder Chriſtian*, becauſe you have depriv'd him of his *Reaſon*? Or is he convinc'd of your being in the right, becauſe you purſue your Adverſary with the moſt *Ignominious Names*, and call him *Fool* and *Knave*? This only by way of Digreſſion. But what can a Man of my Circumſtances do in this Caſe? My deſire is to be ſatisfi'd concerning the *Pope's Authority*, and the *Title* he has to the *Care*

of

of the *Univerſal Church*: You ſay, that all this is an *Innovation*, an *Uſurpation*, and no where acknowledg'd or ſuppos'd in any *Ancient Canon* or *Law* of the Church. Biſhop *Montague* on the other hand, ſeems to aſſert this *Authority*, as founded upon the *Ancient Canons* of the Church: that nothing could be of force relating to the *Univerſal Church*, but what was Conſented to and Ratifi'd by him, to whoſe Care it was committed. And now, while I have a *Biſhop Affirming* on the the one ſide, and a *Divine Denying* on the other, what am I to do? What Notion can I frame? If I diſſent from you, I may be call'd *Fool* and *Knave* indeed for my pains, which will not edifie at all; and yet to ſubmit for fear of *Hard Words*, will be a ſort of Slavery. When I conſider, that *all Popiſh Divines* and *General Councils* are on the one ſide, with whom too concur many *Proteſtants*, me-thinks if it ſhould come to Voting, I know which ſide would carry it; and then if we do not go by Votes, the Reaſon that even *Proteſtants* bring in behalf of this Aſſertion, is very prevalent.

Div. What *Proteſtants* are thoſe you mean, you have nam'd but one yet, and what *Reaſons* are thoſe?

Seek. I have not leiſure now, but at next Meeting I 'll give you a more particular Account.

Second Dialogue.

Seeker. I AM now to make good my Word: and Firſt as to the *Reaſon*, which ſome *Proteſtants* lay down, for maintaining a *Neceſſity* of *One Supreme Paſtor* having a Superintendency over the *Whole Catholic Church*. Biſhop *Montague* delivers it in theſe words, *Antid. pag.* 51. *The Church is a well order'd Army, a Multitude Regularly diſpos'd. Wherever there are* Many *and* Multiplicity, *that* Order *and* Concord *may be preſerv'd, all Beginning muſt be deriv'd from One. And from whence can all Beginning better flow, than from the Principal Church? This Prerogative is due to the Place: Let the Biſhop of* Rome, *if he pleaſe, have the Primacy of Place, of Order likewiſe, and for both theſe, that of Excellency too. The Communion and good Un-*

ſtanding amongſt the Prieſts of the Church, and the Profeſſion *of the* ſame Entire *and* Unſpotted Faith *could never be maintain'd and preſerv'd even as to* Order, *and ſometimes as to* Execution, *but by ſome* ONE: *And hence, by the Conſent of the Chriſtian World, this was deriv'd from the* Chair *and* See *of* Peter, *to wit, the Biſhop of* Rome. And *p.* 158. *Antiquity did certainly attribute to him the Headſhip of Prieſthood over all; neither do we refuſe him this Principality: we grant him to be the Fountain of Prieſthood, and the Top of all Biſhops.* Don't you here obſerve a very forcible Reaſon, for the allowing of ſome *One Primate* over the whole Church of Chriſt? You know how Eſſential and Neceſſary *Order*, *Union*, and the *Profeſſion of One and the ſame Entire Faith* is to the Church of Chriſt: And here the Biſhop aſſerts, that this *Order*, *Union* and *Profeſſion of One Faith* amongſt all, could never be preſerv'd, but by the *Primacy* of ſome *One Biſhop* over the whole; which in effect is to ſay, that without this *Primacy* there could be no *Catholic Church*; ſince without *Union*, there can be no *Church*; which is nothing but a *Congregation of Many*, *United in one Faith.* So that what *Neceſſity* there is, for excluding *Diſorder* and *Confuſion* from the Church, the ſame there is for maintaining a *Primate*; not only in *Order*, but *Dignity* and *Authority* too, which he calls *Excellency*, who may juſtly claim a *Precedency* before all others, give *force* to ſuch *Laws*, as concern the *Whole Church*, and ſee that they be *Executed*, as occaſion ſhall require. Thus far this *Biſhop* ſeems to reaſon in behalf of a *Primacy*, declares it to have been the Practice of *Antiquity*, and that by Conſent of the whole Chriſtian World, the Biſhop of *Rome* was acknowledg'd to be this *Primate.* And as to the *Neceſſity* of a *PRIMACY*, I find Dr. *Sherlock* not long ſince inclin'd in ſome manner to allow of it; ſince for the maintaining the Peace and Communion of the Catholic Church, he ſays, *Biſhops may grant unto ſome* ONE *Biſhop a* PRIMACY, *for the preſervation of Catholic Unity and Communion, who by a General Conſent may be entruſted with a Superior Power of Calling Synods, receiving Appeals.* This he concludes in caſe of *Difference* ariſing amongſt *National Churches*, and their *Biſhops*; this being the only effectual Means left, for the compoſing ſuch Diſorders. And becauſe, through the common Miſery and Frailty

Vind. of Def. p. 124, 127.

of

of Mankind, there can never be wanting ſome *Differences* betwixt *National Churches*; hence upon the ſame Grounds of this Doctor one may reaſonably conclude, that there *muſt be* always ſuch a ſtanding *Primacy* granted to ſome *One Biſhop*, who by a *Superior Power* of *Calling Synods*, and *Receiving Appeals*, may be always ready to obviate ſuch Miſchiefs deſtructive of *Catholic Unity*. And this Conſideration is farther enforc'd; becauſe there is as great a Neceſſity of preſerving *Catholic Unity* betwixt different *Nations*, as a *National Unity* betwixt the Clergy and People of a *Kingdom*: And therefore, as in every Kingdom there is a ſtanding *Primacy*, not only of *Order*, but of *Juriſdiction too*, reſiding in ſome *One Biſhop*, for the ſecuring the *Peace* and *Unity* of the *National Church*: So in the *Univerſal Church* there ought to be a like *Primacy*, for the maintaining of *Catholic Unity* throughout the *whole Body* of True Believers. For otherwiſe, what a *Portentous Thing* will the *Catholic Church* of Chriſt be, in which the *Principal Parts* are not in *Union*, but *Divided* from each other!

Divine. What do you tell me of theſe Reaſons, which are only grounded upon the Conceſſions of *Montague* and *Sherlock?* Muſt we be oblig'd to ſtand by what they granted? I know no reaſon, why we ſhould be ty'd to abide by what *ſome Proteſtants* have affirm'd, any more than the *Papiſts* think themſelves oblig'd to ſet down by what *ſome Schoolmen* have ſaid, who are ſo frequently thrown by as Abuſers of their Church's Genuin Doctrin. *Prim. Fath. no Pap. p. 29.*

Seek. So that in this you'll be contented to follow the *Papiſts*. I never expected that You, who condemn the *Papiſts* with that ſeverity, and pretend to *Reform* them, would ever have humbled your ſelves ſo low, as to fly for ſhelter under their Example, and let *their Failings* be *your Defence*. Tho' I think the Caſe too here is very unlike, and not ſerviceable to you at preſent: For the *Papiſts* think it an *Abuſe*, that every *Schoolman's* Opinion ſhould be ſet out as the *Doctrin* of *their Church*; In which I hope you'll allow 'em to have ſome reaſon: what is this to you, who having made a *Challenge* concerning the *Pope*, to all the Prieſts in *England*, have Learned Men of your own Church, who Anſwer your *Challenge*, and ſeem to *Contradict* what you *aſſert?* 'Tis poſſible, you may

have ſo good an Opinion of your ſelf, as to undervalue the Judgment of all, however Eminent in your own Church, who are not of your Mind: but what ſatisfaction is this to any *Indifferent Man* in my Circumſtances, who being deſirous to frame a *True Notion* of ſuch a *Supreme Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, a Point of *great Concern* in Matter of Religion, finds ſuch *contrary Opinions* concerning it? How ſhall I know where to ſtrike in, whether with the *Divine*, the *Doctor*, or the *Biſhop?* If on the *one ſide*, I muſt help to *pull the Supremacy down*; if on the *other*, as zealouſly to *ſet it up*. And this is no Matter of *Indifferency:* for till I am ſatisfi'd concerning the *Right* of this *Supreme Authority*, my Buſineſs is not to ſeek with which *Diviſion* of the *Reformation* I am to joyn: ſince no part of the *Reformation* at all can ſtand, if that *Authority* was *Lawful*, from whence they *Separated*, and without whoſe Conſent nothing of this kind could be *valid*, in which the *Whole Church* was concern'd.

But I proceed to let you ſee, how much thoſe *Reaſons* have weigh'd with many *Leading Proteſtants*, beſides thoſe now mention'd, in order to the acknowledging this *Supremacy Eccleſiaſtical*, its *Neceſſity* in the *Church*; and the *Practice* of it in the *Biſhop of Rome*, within the *Firſt Six Centuries*, to which you appeal. And firſt obſerve how Mr. *Covel* reaſons upon this Subject, who having ſpoken of *One being ſet above the reſt* in the Church of God, *to ſuppreſs the Seeds of Diſſention*, thus goes on: *If this were the principal Means to prevent Schiſms and Diſſentions in the Primitive Church, when the Graces of God were far more abundant and eminent than now they are; nay, if the Twelve were not like to agree, except there had been* ONE CHIEF *among them: For, ſaith* Jerome, *Among the Twelve,* ONE *was therefore choſen, that a* CHIEF *appointed, occaſion of* DISSENTION *might be prevented. How can they think, that Equality would keep all the Paſtors in the World in Peace and Unity? For in all Societies* AUTHORITY *(which cannot be where all are* EQUAL*) muſt procure* UNITY *and* OBEDIENCE. Here you ſee, upon the Conſideration of preventing *Schiſms*, and preſerving *Unity*, ſo Eſſential to the *Catholic Church*, he confeſſes there was *One* over the reſt, even in the *Primitive Times*, and that 'twas

Exam. againſt the Plea of the Innoc.

'twas by the *AUTHORITY* of this *One*, the *Peace* and *Unity* of the Church was procur'd. And to obviate the Objection, of it being thought sufficient, that every *National Church* be at *Union* within it self, tho' they have not *Communion* with one another; he thus Discourses, *ib. The several Kingdoms of several Princes make each of them an Absolute and Several Common-wealth: yet the several Congregations, dispersed throughout several Kingdoms, do All of them make but One Spiritual Common-wealth and Church of Christ, oblig'd in Duty to the Belief and Profession of ONE and the SAME Faith.* And then a little before, he asks this Question: *How can the divided Members of the Church, thus dispersed in several Kingdoms and Nations, be Govern'd, unless some ONE have Authority over them ALL?* So that by his Premisses there is imply'd a a *Necessity* of such *Authority* residing in some *One*, for the keeping *all the Pastors* and *Believers* of the World in *Peace*: for otherwise, says he, *The Church* (thus dispersed throughout the World) *should be in a far worse Case than the meanest Common-wealth; nay, almost than a Den of Thieves, if it were left destitute of Means, either to convince Heresies, or suppress them; yea, tho' there were neither help nor assistance of the Christian Magistrate.* And this is the same, that *Luther* himself had concluded before: *Since God*, says he, *would have ONE Catholic Church throughout the World; it was necessary he should choose some one People, nay some One Father of this one People, to whom and to whose Successors, the whole World should belong and be ONE Sheepfold: and by this Means, out of ALL Nations, however infinitely disagreeing in Manners, should be made ONE Church.* Loc. Com. cl. 1. c. 57.

And this, methinks, seems a very prevalent Reason; for since Christ sent his Apostles over the whole World with this Command, *Go and Teach all Nations*, and yet intended there should be but *One Catholic Church*; it is certain, that the *several Nations* of the World, however making *several distinct, Absolute, Politic Bodies*, Govern'd by *different Laws*, should yet all of them profess *One Faith* and *Religion*, and make but *One Catholic Church of Christ*, *One Body*, Ephes. 2. 16. and consequently be Superintended by *One Visible, Ecclesiastical Head*, by whose *Authority* this Church should be always preserved

One;

One; it being otherwise certain, that if the *Governors* of Christ's *Church* be as *Many*, as *Absolute*, and as *Independent* from all Subordination, as are the *Governors* of *Temporal Kingdoms*, that the *Church* will be as much *Divided* as are the *Nations*: and consequently that the *Catholic Church* can be no more *One*, than the *Divided Kingdoms* of the World are *One*. And upon this Consideration, I suppose it was, Mr. *Jacob* thus reason'd against *Hooker* out of his own Concessions: *Every Visible Church, truly and properly so call'd, ought to have a correspondent Ecclesiastical Government: But there is a Catholic, Universal Visible Church on Earth:* Ergo, *There is, and ought to be on Earth a Catholic or Universal Ecclesiastical Government.* Which Conclusion, he says, every Child may infer out of those Premisses, which are allow'd however by so many *Protestants*. Thus he only upon supposal of a Catholic Visible Church. And this, I question not, was the ground of Mr. *Cartwright*'s short Reflection upon this Subject: *If it be necessary*, says he, *for keeping of Unity in the Church, that One Archbishop should be Primate over all; why not as meet, for the keeping of the WHOLE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, there should be ONE Archbishop over all?*

Prim. Fath. no Pap. p. 30.

Div. I tell you again, Let these Men say what they please: I do no more pin my Faith upon the *Groundless Concessions* of *some Protestant Writers*, than the *Papists* do upon the Concessions of some of their Church-Writers.

Seek. But, Sir, you ought to consider, that for me to become *Protestant*, my Reason ought to be convinc'd of the Truth of that Profession. And while I hear so much fair and forcible Reason laid down even by *Protestants* themselves, to shew the *Necessity* of a *Universal Primate* to Superintend the whole Church: can you imagine that your Magisterial slighting is enough to put in the Ballance, and weigh down all they alledge? This looks something like aspiring to an *Infallibility*, whilst all these Learned Mens Reasons are thrown by, as *Groundless Concessions*; and Your Judgment alone is to be submitted to. Is not this a kind of setting up for *Pope*, whilst you are labouring to pull him down? But I must tell you, this rough dealing of yours with these Eminent Men, is no small disadvantage to the *Protestant* Cause: For what Confidence

can

can any *Private* Man have of his *own Reaſoning*, when he ſees the *Reaſons* of ſo many *Great Doctors* and *Guides* of his Church caſt by with ſuch Contempt? If *Reaſon* is to be my *Guide*, what diſtruſt ought I to have of mine, when I ſee thoſe that ſhould direct me, ſo eaſily miſtaken, in valuing that for *Reaſon*, which you ſay are nothing but *Groundleſs Conceſſions*? You muſt give me leave therefore as yet, to go on in the *Proteſtant way*, and to take the *Reaſons* of theſe Men for *Reaſon*, till I have ſomething more than *Huffing* and *Big words* to confute it. And therefore I go on, and look ſtill forward in their Conſiderations upon our preſent Subject.

And here, as hitherto we have ſeen them contending to demonſtrate the *Neceſſity* of a *Supreme Paſtoral Authority* for the keeping the *Whole Church* in *Peace*; ſo now farther I find them inclin'd, to allow this Authority to reſide in the Biſhop of *Rome*. Hear how expreſs *Melanchthon* is upon this Point: *As there are ſome Biſhops*, ſays he, *who Preſide over many Churches*: So *the Biſhop of* Rome *is Preſident over* ALL BISHOPS: *and this Canonical Policy no Wiſe Man, as I think, do's or ought to diſallow*, &c. *For the Biſhop of* Rome *is, in my opinion, profitable to this end, that Conſent of Doctrin may be maintain'd: wherefore an Agreement may eaſily be eſtabliſh'd in this Article of the Pope's Supremacy.* Mr. *Jacob* preſſes the ſame Reaſon: *By acknowledging*, ſays he, *a Catholic Viſible Church, it follows neceſſarily, that there is, and ought to be on Earth a Univerſal Government Eccleſiaſtical.—For if there be properly One Viſible Church and Government Eccleſiaſtical throughout the World, then this muſt be in ſome one Place eminently: for ſome whether we muſt go, when Chriſt bids us, Tell the Church: now there is no Place in all the World ſo likely as* Rome *is, to be the Viſible and Spring-head of Univerſal Government of the Catholic Church.* *Cartwright* is likewiſe of the ſame mind, declaring freely: *This Point of keeping Peace in the Church, is one of thoſe*, ſays he, *which requires as well a Pope over all Archbiſhops, as one Archbiſhop over all Biſhops in a Realm.* And then go's on: *If an Archbiſhop be neceſſary for calling a Provincial Council, when the Biſhops are divided; it is neceſſary there be alſo a Pope, who may call the General Council, when Diviſion is between the Archbiſhops. For when the Churches of one Province be divided from other, as you ask me, ſo I ask you, Who*

Cent. Ep. Theol. Ep. 74.

Reaſ. taken out of Gods Word, &c. p. 24.

2 Repl. par. 1. p. 582.

Who shall assemble them together? Who shall admonish them of their Duty, when they are assembled? If you can find a way, how this may be done without a Pope, the way is also found whereby the Church is disburden'd of the Archbishops. Some *Reform'd Protestants* have carry'd this on farther yet, asserting the *High Priest* of the *Jews* to have been in a *Figure* the *Supreme Head of the whole Catholic Church*, who, tho' Visible only in the Province of *Jewry*, yet had other Nations, even the *Ethiopians*, (as appears in the *Acts*) subject, and acknowledging Homage to Him: *So that*, say they, *He was not a Provincial Metropolitan, but in very deed an Oecumenical and Universal Bishop of the whole World: And therefore the Pope of* Rome, *who alone maketh claim unto, and is in possession of the like Universal Supremacy, has more warrant in the Word of God to the same, than any Metropolitan or Diocesan, not dependant upon him, has or can have: So that by the Word of God, either there must be no Metropolitans and Dioceſans, or else there must be a Pope*, What think you, Sir, of these Reasons, thus propos'd and urg'd by *Protestant* Pens? They look to me like good and substantial ones: and therefore I must needs tell you, that if you once allow of the Order of *Bishops* and *Archbishops*, to Superintend every *National Church*, for the securing its *Peace*, and maintaining the Profession of *One* and *the same Faith* within it: I think the same Motives will oblige you to allow of a *Universal Pastor*, for having the like Care of the whole Church, Since *Peace* and *Unity of Faith*, is as *Necessary*, and ought as carefully to be maintain'd in the *whole Catholic Church*, as within any *National one*.

Engl. Purit. p. 16.

Answ. to Nub. Test. Pref.

Div. What an impudent Plagiary are you, to quote these *Authors*, without ever mentioning where you stole them. Come, I have discover'd your Haunts; all these are found in *Brerely's Protestant Apology. This is the Armoury out of which* You, and the *Doughty Writers of the Popish Church have furnish'd your selves.* One would have believ'd, that a Man so particular in Quotations, had been very conversant in these Writers: but I perceive, all that you have said, is *wholly stole*; nothing but an *Ungrateful Plagium.*

Prim. Fath. to Pap. p. 30.

Seek. What strange *Insulting* is this! Why, have I been Discoursing with you all this time, do you think, to shew my

own

own Parts, and out of a *Vanity* of being thought one of *great Reading*, or to be *satisfied* concerning this Point of *Controversie?* If the *Reasons* of these Authors are proper in order to bring me and those I am concern'd in, to a right understanding of the truth of this matter, 'tis all I intend and desire: and whether they are immediately taken out of the *Authors* themselves, or out of *Brerely*, 'tis the same thing to me; since 'tis the knowledge of the *Truth*, and the *Peace* of *Conscience* is my Concern, and not the *Vanity* of being thought *Learned*. Well; but this Carping Reply of yours, makes me think, you have spoke lately with the *Answerer to Nubes Testium*, who, almost in these very words of yours triumphs over the *Author* of that *Collection* upon this score.

Div. It may be I have, there's no Disgrace in that, I hope: That *Answerer* has so laid open the *Compiler of Nubes Testium*, that he must set a good Face on't, ever to look abroad again.

Seek. You see he has look'd abroad again in a *Reply* to that *Answerer*, and is so little concern'd for all that is urg'd against him of this kind, that having own'd the Charge, he thinks himself, and his Cause, not at all injur'd by it. And to be serious with you, I have consider'd the whole matter with him; and he assures me, his whole Design in publishing that Collection, was, to let his Country-men see in a little room, how favourably the Holy Fathers express themselves in behalf of such Points, which your *Pulpits* cry out against, as *Inventions*, *Novelties*, and *Additions to the Primitive Church*. So that in this Work he did not consider *himself*, but the *Cause* for which he writ, and, as far as I see, all that *opprobrious* and *insulting* Language vented upon this score, is quite lost upon him; for he values it not at all. You may think him *incens'd and gall'd by it*, as your Friend says he expected: But I can assure you of a contrary Effect; and that if he can but any ways contribute to the opening the Eyes of his *deluded Country-men*, and shew them, what was the *Faith of the Primitive Church*, which they desire to follow, he's unconcern'd at all the Affronts, Reproaches and Contempts his Adversaries endeavor to cast upon him in this Performance: And therefore you see he thanks the *Answerer* for his Discovery.

Vindic. of his Princip. p. 57.

Div. Can he be hearty in sending Thanks for the discovery

of that thing, which hath made him ridiculous and wholly contemptible in the Eyes of all Scholars? This is one of the most extravagant things I ever met with in Print, and I cannot refrain giving it its true Name, and telling the World, that I look upon it to be the very *heighth of Impudence*, for a Man to be so far from being asham'd, or from blushing at that, which lays him so open to the World, and makes him to be hiss'd at and ridiculous to all Men, as to thank him for it, who made him such an Object of Contempt and Derision.

Prim. Fath. no Pap. p. 21.

Seek. You speak in the very words of that *Answerer*, and those so *Foul* and *Choleric*, that these Expressions, in a Subject of Religion, are much worse than that very Crime you so vehemently cry out against. If the Author of that *Collection of Fathers* had, like some, who *Preach themselves* instead of *Christ*, writ for himself, and not to shew the Truth of his Religion, this you so tragically urge, had been to the purpose: But at present, whilst, in that little Treatise, he has let our Nation see what the Holy Fathers say upon those Points of Controversie, he has his whole aim. And the whole World is welcom to know, from whence he made that Collection. For when all is said, it comes to this, That he has gather'd the choice Testimonies, scatter'd throughout Twenty Volumes of *F. Natalis Alexandre*, into one little Book; and by publishing them in *Latin* and *English*, has made it fit for the Capacity and Purse of all Readers. This he thought might be call'd a *Collection*; and if you and his Adversaries don't think fit, you may without any offence, give it what Title you please. The Book was publish'd, you know, without any Name; and it being to shew what *Catholics* have to produce in behalf of their *Religion*, 'tis sufficient 'twas done by one of that Church: I am told some of the Church of *England* have gone farther than this, transcribing whole Books of the *Papists*, and publishing them for good *Protestant*.

Ib. pag. 20.

Div. Well, but how improper was he for this Collection, whilst he rely'd wholly upon the Credit and Honesty of the Author, from whence he made it; and could neither answer for the genuineness of the Authors, nor the Sincerity of the Authorities, which he took wholly upon Trust?

Seek. Troth, I would not have you urge this too far, 'twill ruin, I fear, a great many of your Coat, who weekly, from the Pulpit,

Pulpit, tell their Auditory, what ſuch and ſuch *Fathers* ſay, how the *Chaldaic Verſion*, and *Septuagint* have it, give them the Opinion of ſuch *Doctors*, *Hiſtorians*, and *Commentators*, &c. and, many times, know no more of any of theſe, than what they take up upon Truſt, and at Second or Third Hand. I wonder therefore you preſs this Point ſo ſeverely againſt your Adverſary, which muſt certainly fall very heavily, if it were of any weight, upon the *Guides* of your own Church. Men treat generally with *Authors*, *Hiſtorians*, *Commentators*, &c. as they do with *Servants* and *Friends*; and ſuch as, upon *Trial* in many Particulars, they find *Sincere* and *Faithful*, and upon the Aſſurance and Experience of others, are recommended as ſuch, they rely on without ſcruple. This is the Caſe of your Adverſary, as he told you in his laſt Reply, but you go on ſetting out the thing as a great Crime, without taking the leaſt notice of what he ſays; which yet, if not ſufficient to juſtifie him, will bring the whole World to be ſharers in the like Crime. Pray tell me, are all thoſe Fools, do you think, who relate what they hear from your Sermons, and read in your Books, before they have examin'd every Particular with their own Eyes, in the *Authors* you cite? If they are, tell your Auditory ſo, and your Readers, and ſee what will be the Effect of this piece of Scepticiſm. 'Tis true, thoſe who conſider, how many *Falſities* have been Preach'd from the *Pulpits* of late Years; how much *Paſſion* and *Gall* is found in your Books, have much more reaſon to ſcruple of truſting here too far, than ever your Adverſary had of *F. Natalis*. And upon this Conſideration, a Sober and Conſiderable Man of your Church, told me the other day, that he was reſolv'd to read no more Controverſie, becauſe he found you did not write ſo much for *Truth*, as to make a *Party*, and caſt Aſperſions upon your Adverſaries.

Div. But this is not the chief Crime I prov'd againſt him: for beſides this, the Author he made uſe of, was condemn'd to the Flames but Two years before; and this brings the Compiler into a miſerable Condition by this Contempt of the Pope. Every body knows of the Brags of Diſcipline among the *Papiſts*, and of their profeſs'd Obedience to the Pope: but this Behavior of the *Repreſenter*, and of *Sabran* the Jeſuit, whom I catch'd in the ſame Crime and Diſobedience, will ſa- *Prim. Fath. & Pap. p.* 24.

tisfie moſt People, how little ſome Mens Writings agree with their Practices, and what little credit is to be given to their ſo much celebrated Diſcipline, when thoſe that make the greateſt noiſe about it, are at the ſame time diſcover'd to be the moſt notorious Offenders againſt it.

Seek. This you have repeated over and over in ſeveral Pamphlets, but, like one blinded with *Paſſion*, you take no notice of his Anſwer in the *Reply*. He told you there, that he profeſſedly owns the reading of *Condemn'd Books*; and you may obſerve farther, that this is ſo far from being a *Contempt* of the *Pope*, or any *Diſobedience* in him, that 'tis rather a *Duty*, for one in his Poſt, he not doing it but with leave: and pray where's the Crime in this? Becauſe *Fleſh* is forbidden them in *Lent*, is it a *Crime* in thoſe, who eat it with *leave?* You ſeem in this to talk very inconſiderately, and make a noiſe of great *Diſcoveries*, when you find nothing but what was Public before: This looks like ſomething of an Affected Vanity. But let that paſs, 'tis all, at beſt, but an impertinent Cavil: for when the only Queſtion is, *What was the Judgment of the Primitive Fathers concerning our preſent Controverſies?* and there's a Set of Teſtimonies produc'd out of their Writings; what matter's it, whether the *Author* that Collected them, be *Condemn'd* or no, ſince 'tis certain he was not Condemn'd for making that Collection? Or whether the *Publiſher* was a *Collector* or a *Compiler?* This is all but throwing of Dirt, and a new Device of diverting the Reader. If the *Teſtimonies be exact*, the whole Buſineſs is at an end, and all Enquiry beyond that, is nothing to the purpoſe. If a *Sick* Man has *good Phyſic* and *Cordials* given him, *Proper* for his *Recovery*; what matter's it, whether he that has ſo much Charity to adminiſter it, made it up with his *own Hand* or no? Or whether the *Cup* in which he gives it, be his *own*, or *borrow'd?* Yet theſe are the things you urge ſo often; and to ſhew your Parts, you do it as much in *earneſt*, as if it were to the purpoſe. But here lies your Talent; and as you Anſwer'd thoſe *Authorities*, ſo you Reply to me. I have propos'd to you ſeveral weighty *Reaſons*, and laid before you a great number of plain *Teſtimonies*, that ſeem convincing enough to carry the whole Buſineſs againſt you, concerning the *Pope's Supremacy*; and when one would have expected a full

and

and ſatisfactory Anſwer from you, you put us off with only telling us, *Thoſe Reaſons and Teſtimonies are in* Brerely's *Proteſtant Apology.* Marry, and what then? Do's this Anſwer the *Reaſons* or *Teſtimonies*, or ſatisfie the Difficulties? Is this any reaſon to Triumph? Juſt as much as he would have, who being run thro' with his *Enemy's Sword*, had ſo much Skill as to tell the *Artiſt* that *made* it.

Div. But did not that Anſwerer, beſides theſe Diſcoveries, Reply to every *Teſtimony* there produc'd, and ſhew, that they were either wreſted from their true Meaning, or in ſome manner falſifi'd?

Seek. He do's pretend to that, and if you had done it here, it had been much more to the purpoſe than all this Cavil. But after all that Anſwerer has ſaid, I cannot yet be ſatisfi'd concerning this Point. For I find ſo many particular Paſſages in the *Primitive Church*, eſpecially within the *Firſt Six hundred years*, to which you challenge, which do ſo plainly ſeem to imply a *Supremacy in the Biſhop of Rome* above all other Biſhops, that I cannot think it to be, what he calls it, a *Groundleſs Supremacy:* I'll give you an account of ſome that ſeem to be moſt preſſing, and if I urge what is hinted in *Nubes Teſtium*, do you make me the Return of the *Anſwerer*, and if it be ſatisfactory, I'll preſs no farther.

Div. Content.

Third Dialogue.

Seeker. AT preſent therefore we are to take a view of what paſs'd within the *Firſt Six hundred years* after Chriſt, relating to the Subject of our preſent Debate. And whatſoever *Authority*, *Juriſdiction*, or *Superiority* we find to have been acknowledg'd in the *Biſhop* of *Rome* above all other Biſhops, that I ſuppoſe, according to your Principles, you'll likewiſe acknowledge as Good and Lawful. And ſo far as this may be found in the Practice of the Church of thoſe Times, you'll own not to be *Groundleſs*.

Divine. So far I am bound to confeſs, in the Principles of the

the *Answerer*, whose Person I now bear. And therefore make the best of your Search into those Times.

Seek. What think you therefore of *Appeals* made from all Churches and Bishops, to the *Bishop of Rome?* This one Point seems to me of great force; for since *All Appeals* are made from an *Inferior* to a *Higher Court*, *Superior in Authority and Power*, the *Referring Causes* already judg'd by *other Bishops*, and *Appealing from* them to the *Bishop of Rome*, is a Demonstration of the *Bishop of Rome* being esteem'd *Superior to all other Prelates in Authority and Power.*

Div. But you must shew this to have been the confess'd Practice of those First Ages.

Two Rules of Gelasius.

Seek. That's the thing I intend. But first hear two plain Rules rehears'd by Pope *Gelasius*, in his Epistle to the Bishops of *Dardania* in the *Eastern Church.* 1. *According to the Canons, Appeals are to be made from all Parts of the World, to the Apostolic See of* Peter; *but there can be no Appeal from that See to any other.* 2. *The whole Church throughout the World knows, that the See of the Blessed Apostle* Peter, *has a Power of Repealing any Sentence pass'd by any other Bishops whatsoever.* Are not these very great Prerogatives of the Bishop of *Rome*, and such as set him in *Jurisdiction*, *Authority* and *Power*, above all other Bishops throughout the Christian Church? Consider what it is, That, according to the Prescript of the *Canons*, *Appeals* are to be made from *A L L* Parts of the World to the *See of Rome*; And that from *Rome* there can be no *Appeal* to any other See. Is not this as much as, That *Rome* has a *Superiority* over all other *Sees*, and that none is Superior to it? What is it again, that the Bishop of *Rome* may *make void the Sentence* of any *other Bishops?* Can this be done, but by a *Superior Authority?* What can be more plain than this? And yet all this was deliver'd within the time you require; for *Gelasius* died in the Year 496. and commanded this Epistle of his to be sent to all the Bishops of the Eastern Church, both Orthodox and Schismatic.

Div. What said *Danæus* on the like occasion? These are only the Words of a *Pope in his own Cause*: and what do they signifie? If the *Practice* of the Church had been agreeable to these suppos'd Rules, 'twould be something to the purpose.

Seek.

✓ *Seek:* This Epistle was writ to the Bishops of the *Eastern* Church, against the Proceedings of *Euphemius* Bishop of *Constantinople*: and can you suppose *Gelasius* Bishop of *Rome*, to have writ thus, so positively asserting the *Prerogative* of his See, as a thing known to all the Churches of the World, unless it had been grounded on *Practice*, and a *Receiv'd Rule* throughout the World? Had it been otherwise, he had certainly ruin'd his own Cause, by solemnly claiming a Right which belong'd not unto him. But that you may perceive how far this was the Practice of the Church in those Times, and a *Right* which the Bishop of *Rome* might justly claim, you may see it assented to and Confirm'd in the *General Council* held at *Sardis* in the Year 347. in which were assembled more than Three hundred Bishops, of which number were several of those eminent Fathers, who had been Members of the great Council of *Nice*. In this Council then it was, that all this *Power* and *Authority* above mention'd, was by Law of the Church declar'd to be in the Bishop of *Rome*. And accordingly it was thus Decreed.

1. *That if any Bishop be condemn'd, and he thinks his Cause to be Good, he may Appeal to* Julius *Bishop of* Rome; *and if the Bishop of* Rome *judge that the Cause ought to be heard again, let it be so, and let him appoint Judges: But if he approve the Sentence already pass'd, let it so stand as he determines it.* Can. 3. *Decrees of the Council of* Sardic.

2. *That if any Bishop be depos'd by the Sentence of the Neighboring Bishops, and the Bishop so depos'd Appeal to* Rome; *let no other Bishop be Install'd in his See after his Appeal, till the Cause be decided by the Bishop of* Rome. Can. 4.

3. *That if any Bishop, accus'd and depos'd by the Neighboring Bishops, Appeals to the Bishop of* Rome, *and he judges it fit that the Cause should have a second Hearing, let him please to write to the Bishops of the next Province, to make a strict Examen into the Affair, and to give Sentence, according to what they find to be Just. But if any one desires, that his Cause should be heard again, and solicits the Bishop of* Rome *to send Priests* (è latere suo) *from his own Presence, it shall be in the Power of the Bishop to do what he thinks fit: And if he conceives it proper to send some having Authority from him, to sit with the other Bishops, and judge the Cause, let it be so done. But if he think it sufficient, that the Bishops*

shops already there present should give final Sentence, let him do what shall seem best in his most wise Judgment. Can. 7.

Here you see all that Authority mention'd above by *Gelasius*, to be assented to, and confirm'd upon the Bishop of *Rome*, by a General Assembly of the Prelates of the *Eastern* and *Western* Church, that is, of the whole *Catholic Church*. And when I see all this so solemnly declar'd in this Council, *viz.* 1. *That any Bishop from* ANY PART OF THE WORLD *may Appeal to the Bishop of* Rome. 2. *That nothing after the Appeal, shall be done in the Cause by any other Bishops; but that it shall wholly depend upon the Decision of the Bishop of* Rome. 3. *That Appeals may be made from a Synod of several Bishops, to the Bishop of* Rome; *and that the Bishop of* Rome *may either send one with Commission from himself, or appoint what Judges he shall think fit; and that all shall stand to his Determination.* I cannot but judge from hence, that the Christians of those Primitive Ages of the Church, did acknowledge a *Supremacy in the Bishop of Rome* over all other Bishops whatsoever. For tis impossible to conceive, that *Appeals* can be made to a *Bishop*; that it shall be in his Power to *confirm* or *make void* the *Sentence* pass'd by any *other Bishop* or *Bishops* of a Province; and that no *Appeals* shall be made from him to any other; without conceiving at the same time a *Superior Authority, Power and Jurisdiction* in him, above all such other Bishops. And therefore, however I may wish it were so, yet I can't tell how, in reason, to call this, as you do, a *Portentous Authority*, a *Groundless* and *Usurp'd Supremacy*.

Answ. to Nub. Test. p. 23. *Div.* This Attempt of this Synod is sufficient to shew, that the Bishop of *Rome* had no such Power before that time.

Seek. The *Romanists* undertake to shew, that this was the Practice of the Church before this time; and that 'twas here solemnly declar'd, only in opposition to the *Arians*, who were displeas'd with the Bishop of *Rome*, for having restor'd to their Sees, some Bishops of the *Eastern* Church, who had been depos'd by their Faction. But however this may be, I cannot but be surpris'd at this your Reply: For what signifies it, whether *this Authority* was in the Bishop of *Rome* before this Council or no; since we are not now discoursing of its *Origin*, and when it began; but whether there was any such thing

thing within the *Firſt Six hundred years?* And therefore ſince this Council was held within that time, there's no more requir'd for the ending our preſent Controverſie.

Div. The *Canons* of this Synod were admitted to no Authority in the Church, becauſe they were not admitted into the *Code of the Univerſal Church.* *Anſw. to Nub. Teſt. p. 23.*

Seek. Do's therefore the *Code of the Church* give Authority to the *Canons* of a *General Council?* The Synod of *Sardis* was approv'd and receiv'd in the Church, and from this *Authority* of a *General Council*, do all the *Canons* of it become *Authentic*, whether they are inſerted into the *Code* or no. The Collection of *Canons* has been only the Labor of *Particular* Men; and if the Church receiving it, or any *General Council* approving it, give it Authority, have not all the *Canons* of *Sardis* the ſame Authority, in being Decreed and Approv'd by a General Council? Can you think that a Council, by approving any *Collection of Canons*, do's by this Act *make void* and *annul* all ſuch *Canons*, as are not inſerted in *that Collection?* Shew this, and you'll come to the Point; but till then you do nothing.

Div. The beſt Anſwer any one can make for theſe *Canons*, is, that they were only a *Preſent Temporary Proviſion* limited to *Julius*'s Time, who was a *Catholic*, againſt the Emperor *Conſtantius*, who was an *Arian.* *Anſw. to Nub. Teſt. p. 24.*

Seek. Is this the beſt? Then I ſee you own now the being of ſuch *Canons*, and that they were Decreed by that Council. But you limit them to *Julius* the *Pope* then in being, in oppoſition to the Emperor an *Arian.* Were this true, 'twould be of ſome force in our Caſe: But as far as I perceive, there's no ſuch *Limitation* preſcrib'd in any part of that Council; and this Expoſition of yours ſeems only a bare Conjecture or Preſumption of your own, to help you out of theſe Straits. If there be any ſuch thing in the Council, ſhew it us. But I am convinc'd, that this is only a Chimæra of yours; becauſe I ſee the liberty of *Appealing* to the *Pope* approv'd by this Council, not only to concern the Biſhops within the Dominions of *Conſtantius* the *Arian*, but likewiſe *all other Biſhops* in what part of the World ſoever, tho' under the Emperor *Conſtans*, who was altogether *Orthodox.* Had this Power of *Appealing* been confin'd, and limited to the Biſhops only within the Empire of

Conſtantius, you had then ſomething to produce in favor of what you pretend; but at preſent your Exceptions againſt theſe *Canons* are only Cavils, and I think as *Groundleſs* as you ſay the *Supremacy* is. And to ſhew the nullity of this your Suppoſition, you may obſerve, that theſe Canons of the Council of *Sardis* were in force in *Africa* long after the Death of this Emperor, and were ſo far from being judg'd a *Temporary Proviſion limited to* Julius's *Time*, that they were inſerted into their *Canon Law*, upon the matter of *Appeals* to the *Pope*, even in the following Century, as you may ſee in the Code of Canons made by *Fulgentius Ferandus* Deacon of *Carthage*, who Regiſters theſe Decrees under the Titles of the Fifth and Sixth Canon of the Council of *Sardica*; viz. *That a Condemn'd Biſhop may Appeal, if he will, to the See Apoſtolic: and that during the Appeal, another cannot be ordain'd in his Chair*. From whence 'tis evident, that your *limiting* of theſe Decrees to *Julius*, ſeems little leſs than a vain Preſumption. This again you may ſee farther evinc'd from the Epiſtle of Pope *Gelaſius* to the Biſhops of *Dardania*, who in the Age next following that Century wherein the Council of *Sardica* was held, declares to thoſe Prelates, that it had been a Practice in the Biſhops of *Rome* his Predeceſſors, to receive Appeals from other Parts of the World, and to do Right to all. Hear his own words: *Neither do we omit to put you in mind*, ſays he, *that the Apoſtolic See often, and according to the ancient Practice, has Authority of Abſolving, even without the aſſiſtance of a Synod, ſuch as had been unjuſtly condemn'd by a Synod; and of condemning, without calling a Synod, ſuch as juſtly deſerv'd it*. If this were the ancient Practice of that See, 'tis beyond all queſtion, that this Power of receiving Appeals was not limited to Pope *Julius*, but was freely exercis'd by others that Succeeded him in that Charge. And therefore if this be the *Beſt Anſwer*, as you call it, to theſe Canons, I think the Beſt is but very Indifferent, and not enough to ſatisfie any ſerious Enquirer.

Brev. Can. art. 59, 60.

And that this was ſo practis'd in the See of *Rome* after the Deceaſe of *Julius*, there needs no other Argument than the Conſtitution of the Emperors *Theodoſius* and *Valentinian*, which was publiſh'd, as *Theodoret* ſays, ſoon after the Sixth Council of *Carthage*, wherein 'tis ordain'd, *That every Biſhop, that having*

Hiſt. Eccl. l. 2. *c.* 4.

ving been call'd by the Pope, ſhall refuſe to appear, ſhall be compell'd thereunto by the Governor of the Province. And that there be no doubt left in this Point, the ſame Emperor *Valentinian*, in his Letter to the Emperor *Theodoſius*, gives an account of *Flavianus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* Appealing to the Biſhop of *Rome*, upon occaſion of a Controverſie ariſing in a Concern of Faith: adding likewiſe of himſelf in the ſame Epiſtle, *That he was oblig'd to preſerve inviolated the Dignity and juſt Veneration to the Bleſſed Apoſtle* Peter, *inaſmuch as the Holy Biſhop of* Rome, *to whom Antiquity has given the Preeminence of Prieſthood above all, may have Liberty and Power to Judge of Matters of Faith, and the Cauſe of Prieſts.* And this was not in the time of *Julius*, but a hundred years after. *Appeal of* Flavianus.

Div. If you intend by this Teſtimony, that the *Sole Power of Judging Controverſies of Faith, is in the Pope alone*, you muſt remember how extravagant this Doctrin looks to a great part of the Church of *Rome*, and therefore I think, you had better let this Teſtimony of *Valentinian* alone. *Anſw. to Nub. Teſt. p.* 34.

Seek. I ſee your Buſineſs now is only to embroil the Queſtion. We have no concern at preſent, whether *this Power* be in the *Pope alone*; neither do's this Teſtimony come up to that Point. 'Tis expreſly declar'd in it, 1. *That the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *made his Appeal to the Biſhop of* Rome. 2. *That the Biſhop of* Rome *had a Principality of Prieſthood above all others.* 3. *That he had Authority of Judging Cauſes of Faith and of Prieſts.* This is what I undertook to ſhew you, *viz.* That the Power of receiving *Appeals*, was not *limited* to *Julius*, but was Exerciſed by others his Succeſſors: and that the ſame his *Succeſſors* had *Authority* of Determining Cauſes in ſuch Appeals.

Div. This Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* did not Appeal to the Biſhop of *Rome* alone, but to a Synod of all the *Weſtern* Biſhops: therefore this do's not come up to your purpoſe.

Seek. And is this any diminution, do you think, to the *Authority* of the Biſhop of *Rome*, that the *Appeal* was made by *Flavianus* to *Him* and to the *Biſhops* in Council with him? Juſt as much as he that Appeals to the *King* in *Council* or *Parliament*, affronts the *Supreme Authority* of the *Sovereign*. The King's *Authority* is *Supreme*, whether *Alone* by himſelf, or with his *Council* or *Parliament* aſſiſting: and ſo is likewiſe that of the

Supreme Paſtor. But however, to wave this at preſent, I don't find, but that *Flavianus* Appeal'd to the *Pope*, without thinking the calling of a Synod to be neceſſary for the Deciding his Cauſe: and therefore in his Epiſtle to Pope *Leo*, he thus addreſſes himſelf to him: *My Cauſe wants only your Comfort and Defence, whereby you ought, by your own proper Conſent, to reduce all things to Tranquillity and Peace again. For by this means the Hereſie and Commotions occaſion'd by it, will be eaſily overcome, God giving a Bleſſing to your moſt holy Letters; and likewiſe the Synod, which is now talk'd on, will be excus'd.* Here you ſee plainly, he do's not refer himſelf to a *Synod*, but to the Biſhop of *Rome* alone, acknowledging it to be a Duty belonging to his Charge, to reſtore Peace to all, and That by his own *proper Conſent*, ſignifi'd in his Letters. 'Tis true, as *Leo* ſays in his Epiſtle to *Flavianus*, Ep. 16? *The moſt Pious Emperor being ſolicitous for the Peace of the Church, was willing that a Synod ſhould be call'd.* But then he adds, *Altho' it be moſt evident, that our preſent Affair do's not require to be Treated in a Synod.* Thus you perceive, that here was moſt certainly an *Appeal* made from the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* to *Rome*; and that to be determin'd by Pope *Leo*, to whom it belong'd to provide for the Peace of the Church.

Appeal of Anton. Fuſſal.

Many are the Inſtances that may be produc'd of *Biſhops* Appealing from all Parts of the World to the *Pope*, after the Deceaſe of *Julius*, I ſhall content my ſelf with one or two more. And amongſt many others, that of *Antonius* is remarkable, who being promoted to the Biſhopric of *Fuſſala* in *Africa* by St. *Auguſtin*, afterwards ſhew'd himſelf very unworthy of that Dignity, to the great Scandal and Injury of thoſe under his Charge. Upon which a Synod being call'd, by the care of St. *Auguſtin*, he was ſoon reſtrain'd; and tho' not Depos'd, yet his Authority was much ſhortned by the Conſent of the Fathers. This *Antonius* could not bear, and therefore crying out againſt the Sentence of the Synod, pretending it to be contrary to the Canons, he Appeal'd to *Boniface* Biſhop of *Rome*: And thither was forthwith ſent all that had paſs'd in the *Synod*, and the whole Proceſs of the Cauſe. And St. *Auguſtin* directed at the ſame time Letters to *Celeſtinus* the Succeſſor of *Boniface*, wherein he did not at all *call in queſtion his*

Epiſt. 262.

Power

Power of receiving ſuch *Appeals*, but gave him an account of the whole Affair: and withal produc'd ſeveral Inſtances of Biſhops of *Africa* Appealing to *Rome*; and then apply'd himſelf to him in theſe words: *Take an account of what has paſs'd here in* Africa, *ſince the Deceaſe of that Perſon of Pious Memory Pope* Boniface: *and ſuccour thoſe, who more earneſtly deſire your help in the Mercy of Chriſt, than He do's from whoſe Vexations they deſire to be deliver'd. For the People are threatned with the noiſe of Judgments, open Power, and Military Force, as if to put in Execution the Sentence of the See Apoſtolic, whether by him theſe Rumors are ſpread, or by public Fame. So that miſerable Men, they fear now being Catholics worſe from a Catholic Biſhop, than they did being Heathens, from the Laws of the Catholic Emperors. Do not, I beſeech you, ſuffer theſe things to be, by the Blood of Chriſt, by the Memory of the Apoſtle* Peter, *who admoniſh'd the Chriſtian Prelates not to Tyrannize amongſt their Brethren.* Here you ſee plainly *Appeals* made to the *Pope* after the Death of *Julius*, and S. *Auguſtin* acknowledging them as Good and Lawful; as likewiſe deſiring Pope *Celeſtine* to ſuccour thoſe that were injur'd, and protect the *African* Church from the Evils which threatned it.

Appeal of S. Chryſoſt.

Another Inſtance is that of S. *John Chryſoſtom* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, who having been depos'd in a Synod, was ſent into Baniſhment by Command of the Emperor; from whence being ſoon recall'd, he was willing to eſtabliſh himſelf in his See, in virtue of the Canon of *Antioch*; but *Theophilus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who Preſided in the former Synod, oppos'd him; and proving againſt him, that he had proceeded irregularly, and offended againſt the Canons, he was a ſecond time Depos'd, and condemn'd to perpetual Baniſhment. Upon which he apply'd himſelf to *Rome*, having recourſe to Pope *Innocent*, as appears in his Letters of *Appeal* directed to the ſaid Pope, to whom he thus addreſſes himſelf: *Write, I beſeech you, and by your Authority Decree, that theſe things, that have been ſo wickedly done, We abſent, and not refuſing Judgment, may be Void. Subject them, who have done thus, to the Cenſure of the Church. And ſince I am innocent, having nothing prov'd againſt me, and found guilty of no Crime, command that I be again reſtor'd to my See.* In theſe words, you ſee, is evidently

evidently acknowledg'd by S. *Chrysostom* an *Authority* in the Bishop of *Rome*, of making *void* the *Sentence* of an *Eastern Synod*, of subjecting the Bishops of the *East*, that had been Offenders, to the Punishment of the Ecclesiastical Laws, and of restoring him to his See: all which seems directly against your Pretensions, and are Grounds sufficient to support all that is Defin'd in the Council of *Florence* concerning the *Supremacy*.

Answ to Nub. Test. p. 31. *Div.* S. *Chrysostom* sent the same Epistle to *Venerius* Bishop of *Milan*, and to *Chromatius* Bishop of *Aquileia*: So that if this Epistle prove any Prerogative for *Innocent*, it will prove the same for *Venerius* and *Chromatius*, and that I am sure is no help towards a *Supremacy*.

Seek. 'Tis true, he writ likewise to these Bishops; but his words *Scripsimus ista ad Venerium Mediolan, &c.* can import no more, than that he had given them an account of the Wrong that had been done him, and likely, desir'd their assistance for his Relief: But I can't find, that in any of his Letters to them, he uses any of those Forms of *Appeal*, as he do's to the Pope. Do's he say to them, *Vouchsafe to command by your Authority, that what has been done against me, may be invalid, and the Actors punish'd according to the Canons?* Do's he say to them, *Of one thing I beseech you, that altho' those, who have molested us with these Troubles, are sick of an impenitent and incurable Disease; yet if they will but remedy these things, that then they may not be Punish'd nor Interdicted?* If it were manifest that he had thus apply'd himself to those Bishops, making a *Formal Appeal* unto them, or requiring them to exert their *Authority* in *Repealing the Sentence* pass'd against him, in *Punishing the Offenders*, in *Restoring him to his Bishopric*, 'twould have been no help, as you say, towards a *Supremacy*: but since he had recourse in *this manner* to *Pope Innocent*; and we know no more of his Letters to the other Bishops, but *Scripsimus ista*: I look upon this *Appeal* of his, as a great Argument for the *Supremacy* of the See of *Rome*.

Chrys. ad Innoc. Epist. 2.

Answ. to Nub. Test. ib. *Div.* This Letter of *Chrysostom* was not sent to *Innocent* in particular, but to *some other Bishops* with him; which I take to be the Bishops of his Diocese, and therefore yields no assistance towards the proving a *Particular Prerogative* for *Innocent* in this Case: For 'tis observable, that the Address of the Epistle

Epistle runs altogether in the *Plural Number*, *Congruum robur ac studium sumite: Scribite, precor, & authoritate vestra decernite.*

Seek. This seems to be nothing but a Cavil: for if you observe, as he writes to the Pope in the *Plural Number*, so likewise in the same Epistle, he speaks of himself in the *Plural Number* too; *Absentibus Nobis, & judicium non Declinantibus*; *We being absent, and never refusing to appear.* So that if from hence may be prov'd, that the Letter was directed, not to the *Pope alone*, but to *others* joyn'd with him; it likewise proves, that *Chrysostom* was not *alone* the *Person* condemn'd by the Synod, cast out of his See, and that writ this Epistle, but *some others* with him; which I take to be but a vain and groundless Inference. But I am satisfi'd you cannot be ignorant, how weak this Exception of yours is; since you must needs know, that 'twas a Custom, and is now, amongst the Authors both of the *East* and *West*, when they writ to any *Person* of *Worth* and *Honor*, to make their Address to him in the *Plural Number*: In this manner writ *Eusebius* of *Milan* to Pope *Leo*; the Bishops of *Syria* to *Justinian*: And in this Style run all our *Proclamations*, in which the *King* always speaks in the *Plural Number*, whether issued out by Advice of his Council, or no. But however, the Doubt is easily remov'd by the *Inscription* of the *Letter*, which is directed to the *Pope alone*; and so 'tis cited by *Palladius* and *Photius*.

Div. You go hitherto all upon a Mistake: for *Chrysostom* did not Appeal from the Synod that condemn'd him, to the Bishop of *Rome*; but to a *General Council*, as is apparent from this Epistle it self to *Innocent*, wherein he says, that *he did Appeal to a Thousand Judges, and was prepar'd to clear himself before the whole World.* *Ibid.*

Seek. This is no Evidence of what you pretend; and seems not so much an *Appeal* to a *General Council*, as a *manner* of *Expression* familiar to such as look upon themselves *wrongfully accus'd*, and are earnest to clear themselves: nothing being more common to Men in these Circumstances, than, after having protested their Innocence, to profess themselves willing and ready to refer their Cause to the Hearing of the whole World, and to Appeal to the whole Church. But suppose he did Appeal to a *General Council*, as *Sozomen* seems to relate it, this was before his

his Condemnation, and likely only to stop the Fury of his Judges and Adversaries. But when he saw this could not be effected, the Emperor and Empress being his professed Enemies, and Sentence was now pass'd upon him, he then referr'd his Cause to *Rome*, and Appeal'd to the *Pope*. And pray, what greater Argument for his *Supremacy* than this?

Div. But *Innocent* did not pretend to give Judgment in the Quarrels betwixt *Theophilus* and S. *Chrysostom*, but told him, that *There must be a Synod, which neither side could make Exceptions at, to put an end to this Business:* Upon which account *Innocent* did request of *Honorius*, to call a *Western* Council, which the Emperor readily did.

Seek. This again, I think, don't reach your Point: for 'tis certain Pope *Innocent*, after the *Appeal* made to him, did first annul the Sentence pronounc'd against S. *Chrysostom*, as *Palladius*, a faithful Writer of this History, assures us, who says, That Innocent *having receiv'd both Parties into his Communion, decreed that the Judgment of* Theophilus *should be void and abrogated, and another Synod be call'd out of the* East *and* West. *Gelasius* confirms the same in his Epistle before mention'd, in which he writes, that *A Synod of Catholic Prelates having condemn'd* John *Bishop of* Constantinople, *the See Apostolic alone Absolv'd him, because it consented not to it.* And the Justice of this Absolution was afterwards acknowledg'd by *Cyrillus* the Successor of *Theophilus*, and by *Atticus* who succeeded St. *Chrysostom*, whose Letters upon this Affair may be seen at length in *Nicephorus Calixtus*. And now the *Pope* having thus judg'd of the *Validity* of the *Appeal*, and decree'd that the *Sentence* pronounc'd against S. *Chrysostom* by the *Eastern Synod*, should be *Null*; what Inconvenience in his requiring afterwards, that the whole Controversie should be throughly enquir'd into by a *General Council* for the satisfaction of all Parties, and preventing all Jealousies that possibly might otherwise be rais'd betwixt the Churches of the two Empires? This is nothing but what we see order'd above in the Council of *Sardica*, viz. That if the *Pope*, upon recourse had to him, did judge the Appealants Cause to be good, he might Repeal the Sentence pass'd against him; and after such a Repeal, might order a new Process to be made, and name the Judges

Pall. in Vit. Chrys.

to

to give a Final Deciſion. All this therefore of the Pope deſiring of the Emperor, that a Council might be aſſembled, is no Injury to his Authority, but rather an Inſtance of it, wherein he proceeded according to the Canons of *Sardica*, in receiving the *Appeal*, abrogating the Judgment paſs'd, and appointing new Judges for a Second Hearing. Thus therefore ſtood this Affair, and I don't ſee all the Exceptions you have made againſt it, are any advantage to you in your Deſign of overthrowing the Pope's Authority.

Another Inſtance is that of *Athanaſius*, who being expell'd his See of *Alexandria*, by a Faction of the *Arians*, was afterwards reſtor'd to it again by the Command of *Julius* Biſhop of *Rome*. *The Caſe of Athanaſ.*

Div. I don't find, that *Athanaſius* Appeal'd to *Rome*.

Seek. But 'tis found, that *Athanaſius came to* Rome, *being call'd, and having receiv'd Letters from us*, ſays *Julius*. So that at leaſt 'twas the Pope's Letters brought him thither. But this I don't inſiſt on: 'tis more remarkable, that all that had been acted againſt *Athanaſius* in the Synod at *Antioch*, was argu'd of *Nullity*, becauſe that Council was manag'd without the Conſent of the Biſhop of *Rome*. *Sozomen* is very expreſs in this, relating in his Church Hiſtory, *lib.* 3. How *Julius reprehended thoſe who had been aſſembled at* Antioch, *for clandeſtinly making Innovations contrary to the Council of* Nice, *and that tranſgreſſing the Laws of the Church, they had not call'd him to the Council: for that there was a Sacerdotal Law, which pronounces all thoſe Acts to be void, which were reſolv'd on without the Approbation of the Biſhop of* Rome. *Socrates* gives the ſame account, *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 2. ſaying, *That the Biſhop of* Rome *was not there, neither had he ſent any in his place, altho' the Eccleſiaſtical Canon orders, That no Decrees be eſtabliſh'd for the Church, without the Conſent of the Biſhop of* Rome. *Athan. Apol.* 2.

Div. Theſe two Hiſtorians ſeem to ground what they write, upon *Julius*'s Letter to the Orientals; and if they did, they are guilty of two great Miſtakes: 1. In ſaying there was ſuch a Canon, whereas the Letter it ſelf pretends to no more, than that there was *ſuch a Cuſtom*. 2. In thinking the Letter to be *Julius*'s own, whenas it was a *Synodical Letter* Penn'd only by *Julius*; and by *Ut primum nobis ſcribatur*, was *Anſw. to Nub. Teſt. p.* 29.

meant the *Western Bishops*, whose Letter it was, and not *Julius*'s in particular.

Seek. Here you go upon your *Ifs*. *If they did ground what they write upon* Julius's *Letter, they are guilty of two Mistakes.* But what if they did not, then what is all you say to the purpose? These Historians relate this matter of Fact *positively* and *absolutely*, without any pretext of grounding it on *Julius*'s Letter; and therefore when you come with your *If they grounded it on this Letter*, you only cavil, but bring no solid Exception. And if *Julius* demanded only of the Eastern Bishops, whether they did not know, *That the Custom is, that We ought first to be written to, that what was just might be determin'd hence:* Methinks, this is enough to overthrow your Cause; for if this was the *Custom* and *Practice* of the *Church* in those days, there needs no more to establish the *Supremacy* of the Bishop of *Rome*. *Prescription* in this Case is equivalent to a Law; and if nothing could be *validly determin'd* in a *Synod*, without the *Pope's Consent*, whether this was founded upon an *Ecclesiastical Canon*, or upon the *Practice* of the Church, 'tis much at one as to this Point.

Ib. pag. 30. *Div.* Monsieur *Launoy* will shew you, that *Julius* himself went upon a great mistake; since there is no Canon in the *Code* of the *Universal Church*, nor in the Ancient *Code* of the Church of *Rome*, that makes any mention of such a thing.

Seek. How do's this prove *Julius* in a Mistake, whenas you said just now, *Julius* do's not speak of any *Canon*, but only of a *Custom?* I fear you forget your self. If there was such a *Custom*, *Julius*, you say, affirms no more: and your proving it to have no place in the *Code* of the Church, will not be serviceable in this Case, unless you could first prove, that there was no *Custom of the Church*, but what was made into a *Canon*, and inserted into that *Code*; which you have not done yet, and I apprehend will be a Task of some difficulty.

Div. Well, let this be how it will, these Historians were mistaken, in thinking that Letter to be *Julius's own*, whenas 'twas a *Synodical Epistle*, sent in the name of all the *Western* Bishops.

Seek. How were they mistaken in this, when they mention nothing at all of this Epistle? They make an *Historical Relation*

lation of the matter of Fact, without one Syllable or Hint of *Julius*'s Letter; and yet you will needs *ſuppoſe*, that they grounded all on this, and then pretend to prove they were miſtaken: But firſt you are to *prove*, what you hitherto only *ſuppoſe*, and then you may go on with much more reaſon. And how do's your *Ut primum nobis ſcribatur*, *That We ought firſt to be written to*, evince, that this was not *Julius*'s *particular* Letter, but from all the *Weſtern Biſhops*, whenas you know, as is already ſhewn, that the *Phraſe* of a *Private Letter* did often run in the *Plural Number?* And if there be mention of Πᾶσιν ἡμῖν. *To All us*, and this ſhould import a *Synod*; 'tis certain ſtill, that *Julius* was *Chief* of this Synod, and that the *Weſtern Biſhops* of themſelves had no *Authority* here in this Cauſe relating to the *Eaſtern Church*, but only as being *Aſſiſtants* to the *Pope*, and in *Council* with him, who had a *Superintendency* over the *Whole Catholic Church*. And therefore, to let you ſee, in whom the *Authority* was lodg'd, you may obſerve, that however there was a *Synod*, yet that 1. *Athanaſius came to* Rome *by the Citation*, not of the Synod, *but of Julius*, as *Theodoret* relates it. *Theod. Hiſt. Eccl. l. 2. c. 4.* 2. That *Euſebius having done in the Council of* Antioch, *what he pleas'd, ſent an Embaſſador to* Julius *Biſhop of* Rome, *requiring him to be Judge in the Affair of* Athanaſius, *and to call the Cauſe before him*, as *Socrates* has it. 3. That *Julius*, upon the Information of one of the Parties, as the Common Judge, did *appoint them both a Day* for their appearing, and that according to the *Canons*: *Julius*, ſays Theodoret, *proceeding according to the Canon of the Church, commanded the* Euſebians *to preſent themſelves at* Rome; *and likewiſe order'd the Divine* Athanaſius, *to anſwer in the Court for himſelf.* 4. That *after the Abſolution of* Athanaſius, Urſacius *and* Valens *the Chief of the* Arians, *ſeeing themſelves excluded from the Communion, came in Perſon to crave Pardon of* Julius *Biſhop of* Rome, *for having condemn'd an Innocent*; as 'tis related by *Sulpitius Severus*. 5. That theſe two *Arians*, in the *Act* of their *Penance* given in Writing to the *Pope*, thus expreſs themſelves: *We confeſs to your Holineſs, in preſence of all your Prieſts, our Brethren, that all thoſe things that are come to your Ears againſt* Athanaſius *are falſe and feign'd: and for this cauſe we earneſtly deſire to be admitted to Communion with him: and principally, becauſe your Piety, out of your natural* *Soc. l. 2. c. 11.* *Theod. ib.* *Hiſt. Sac. l. 2.*

Goodness, has vouchsafed to pardon our Error. And we promise, that if those of the East, *or* Athanasius *himself, do maliciously call us to Judgment, we will not depart from what you shall ordain.* So *Athanasius* and *Sozomen.* These Particulars seem clearly to demonstrate, who was the *Judge* in this Cause, and in whom the Authority lay: For whilst we see all the *Application* made to the *Pope*, that the *Cause* was referr'd to *Him* by the *Eastern Bishops*; that the *Arians* repenting of their falsly accusing *Athanasius*, ask'd Pardon of *Him*, desir'd of *Him* to be admitted again into the Church; presented their *Act of Penance* to *Him*; acknowledg'd that *He* had pardon'd their Error, and promis'd for the future to stand to *His* Arbitration: it seems very evident, that the *Pope* was the *Judge* in this Affair, and that the Synod of Bishops, were only as Assisting, or in Council with him.

Athan. Apol. 2. Soz. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 22.

The Case of Cecilian.

One more Instance I'll produce of this kind, and that is the Case of *Cecilianus* Bishop of *Carthage*, who having the *Donatist Bishops* of *Africa* his Enemies, had been severely Persecuted by them, and Condemn'd in several of their Synods, in which assisted the Primate of *Numidia*; and yet S. *Augustin* in a Letter declares to some of those Bishops, that, notwithstanding all that had been done against him, *Cecilianus* had no reason to be much concern'd, because he was in Communion with the Bishop of *Rome*, before whom he was ready to clear himself, if his Adversaries should at any time endeavor to remove him from his See. Hear S. *Augustin*'s own words: *Secundus* (Primate of *Numidia*) *ought to have been the more careful in not disturbing the Peace, inasmuch as* Carthage *was a Capital City, from whence the Evil would spread it self throughout all* Africa.—*It had besides a Bishop of great Authority, who might contemn his numerous Adversaries conspiring against him, because he saw himself in Communion with the Church of* Rome, *in which has always flourish'd the Prerogative of the Apostolic Chair, and likewise with other Nations, from whence* Africa *first receiv'd the Gospel, where he was ready to justifie himself, if his Adversaries should endeavor to alienate from him those Churches.* The Emperor *Constantine* was importun'd afterwards by the *Donatists* to decide this Contest; but he referr'd it to be Judg'd by *Melchiades* Bishop of *Rome*, together with three other Bishops of *France*:

Epist. 162.

France: in order to which the Emperor thus writ to the *Pope*: *I judg'd it fit*, ſays he, *that* Cecilianus, *together with Ten Biſhops that accus'd him, and Ten others whom he thought neceſſary for his Defence, ſhould Sail to* Rome, *and there his Cauſe be heard before you, and likewiſe before* Rheticius, Maternus, *and* Marinus *your Collegues, whom I have order'd to haſten to* Rome, *according to what the moſt Holy Law of God, as you know, requires.* Upon which S. *Auguſtin* thus writes to the *Donatiſts*: *Your Predeceſſors*, ſays he, *referr'd the Cauſe of* Cecilianus *to* Conſtantine *the Emperor*; *but becauſe* Conſtantine *did not preſume to be Judge in the Cauſe of a Biſhop, he committed it to be decided by Biſhops: which was accordingly done in the City of* Rome, Melchiades *Biſhop of that Church Preſiding, with many other his Collegues.* Now theſe *French* Biſhops were put in Commiſſion, at the Requeſt, as S. *Auguſtin* obſerves, of the *Donatiſts*, who deſir'd the whole Cauſe might be referr'd to them, becauſe they ſuſpected *Melchiades*, who always communicated with *Cecilianus*. However, the Emperor knowing to whom the Cauſe did rightly belong, brought it before the *Pope*, and tho' he had other Collegues aſſiſting with him, yet 'twas the Biſhop of *Rome* Preſided, 'twas he pronounc'd the final Sentence, *Ipſius Beati Melchiadis ultima eſt prolata Sententia*, ſays S. *Auguſt.* Which the ſame Father expreſſes again moſt clearly in another place, writing to *Primianus*: *Vouchſafe to entertain*, ſays he, *Cecilianus, who is innocent: he refus'd to appear before your Predeceſſors, and reſerv'd his Cauſe to the whole World, as you did to the Council of* Numidia: *if the See of* Bagai *declar'd You innocent, how much more did the See Apoſtolic diſcharge Him?*

Epiſt. 162.

Conc. 2. *in Pſ.* 36.

From all which 'tis very remarkable, 1. That tho' *Cecilianus* had been Condemn'd by ſeveral *Synods* in *Africa*, yet, according to S. *Auguſtin*, he might ſtill Appeal to the Biſhop of *Rome*, and from thence expect Relief againſt the Attempts of his Adverſaries. 2. That the Emperor refus'd to be *Judge* in the *Cauſe of Biſhops*, but committed it to be heard by the Biſhop of *Rome*, to whom, as he ſays, the *Law of God* oblig'd him to refer it. 3. That tho' other Biſhops were joyn'd with the *Pope*, yet 'twas in compliance with the Requeſt of the *Donatiſts*; and that the *Pope* was ſtill *Chief*, and *Judge* in the Cauſe, by whom, as S. *Auguſtin* ſays, *Cecilianus* was acquitted.

4. That

4. That what S. *Augustin* Discours'd upon this Subject of *Cecilianus*'s Appeal to *Rome*, was not founded on the Canons of *Sardica*, which were unknown to Him and to the *Africans*; and consequently that this was the Rule and Practice of the Church, independent of those Canons.

Answ. to Nub. Test. p. 33. *Div.* This Instance is too weak for your Design, and to very little purpose, since in this it appears, that several *other Churches*, as well as that of *Rome*, did enjoy the *Prerogative* of having an *Apostolical Chair*.

Seek. I see no such thing asserted by S. *Augustin* in this Passage: But however, suppose this to be so; yet where is it said of any *other Church*, what is here affirm'd, by this great Doctor, of the *See of Rome*, viz. *Romana Ecclesia in qua SEMPER viguit Apostolica Cathedra PRINCIPATUS. In it has ALWAYS flourish'd the PRINCIPALITY of the Apostolic Chair?* Let other Churches have the *Prerogative* of an *Apostolical Chair*, yet if in the *See of Rome* has always flourish'd the *Principality of this Prerogative*, as S. *Augustin* says, 'tis all, I presume, the *Romanists* pretend to, and what they are like to carry without difficulty, if there be no Exceptions of greater moment, than what you have propos'd, which deserve no farther consideration; and therefore I proceed to enquire, what farther Grounds are to be found in Antiquity for the *Supremacy*, which you so zealously impugn, in contradiction to the *Romanists*.

Fourth Dialogue.

Seeker. HItherto we have chiefly confin'd our Search within the matter of *Appeals*: now we'll take a little more compass, and enquire into all those *Acts*, that are the best Arguments of *Ecclesiastical Power*; to wit, *The Presiding in Councils, giving Authority to their Decrees, or making them void, the Condemning of Heresies, Excommunicating the Obstinate*, &c. If we find the Bishop of *Rome* Exercising these Acts *Universally*, and by a singular Prerogative above all other Bishops in the *Primitive Church*, we must then necessarily conclude,

clude, that his *Authority* and *Power* was *Supreme*, above that of all other Prelates of the Church. And First as to *Councils*, pray observe how the *Pope's Authority* did in a most particular manner shew it self in those Assemblies; and to instance only in Two of them, *viz.* of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*.

And *First*, as to the *Ephesine Council*, 'tis evident from *Celestin's* Letter cited in the First Part of the Council, *cap.* 15. That tho' the Cause was of *Nestorius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, Patriarch of the *East*, and the Council held at *Ephesus*, likewise in the *Eastern Church*; yet that the Bishop of *Rome* was so far here concern'd, that he substituted *Cyril* Bishop of *Alexandria* in his Place, to *Preside* in the Council; and order'd him to Depose *Nestorius*, if he did not Recant within the time prefix'd him; *Taking upon you the Authority*, says he to *Cyril*, *of our Chair, supplying our Place, and using our Power, see this Sentence with all rigor executed upon him.* And the Fathers of the Council themselves confess'd, that what was executed here, was by Commission from the *Pope*: And therefore in the *Second Action*, giving an account to the *Pope's Legats* of what had pass'd in the Council before their arrival, they tell them, *That* Cyril *of* Alexandria, *who is at the Head of all the rest, represents* Cælestin, *whose Place he holds.* Then the Letters were read, sent from the Pope by his Legates, and the Fathers, *Act.* 1. own his Authority in professing, that *Being oblig'd by the Holy Canons, and by the Letter of our Holy Father and Fellow-Minister* Cælestin *Bishop of* Rome, *we proceed*, say they, *to pronounce this mournful Sentence against him.* And *Firmus* Bishop of *Cæsarea* declar'd that the *Synod had observ'd the Rule prescrib'd by the Holy See.* Upon which one of the Legates return'd the Council Thanks, *Act.* 2. *For that they were united by such Holy Acclamations to their Holy* H E A D; adding, *That 'twas confess'd by all Ages, that* Peter, *the Prince and Head of the Apostles, the Pillar of our Faith, and Foundation of the Catholic Church, receiv'd from Christ the Keys of his Kingdom; That he at this time lives, and will always in his Successors, and exercise this Power: and 'tis his Successor, our Blessed Pope* Cælestine, *who has sent us to this Synod, to supply his Place.* After this, the Acts of the Council being read, they Confirm'd them according to the Authority given them by *Celestin*, who again Confirm'd them at *Rome*,

Counc. of Ephes.

Here

Here you see, how far the Bishop of *Rome* exerted his Authority; insomuch, that tho' this was a Synod held in the *Eastern Church*, and in the Cause of the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, yet that the *Pope* claim'd it as his *Right*, to *Preside* there; and because he could not be present, substituted *Cyril* in his Place, ordering him to execute Sentence upon *Nestorius*, if he did not Repent: and that this he was to perform, by the *Authority* of the See of *Rome*, and by the *Power* of *Cælestin* Delegated to him. Are not these Great things of the Bishop of *Rome*, and undeniable Arguments of his *Authority* and *Power* above other *Bishops* and *Patriarchs*; since we see all this in a *General Council* of the *East*, without any Demur, Surprise, or Contradiction of any of the Fathers there? And then to hear the *Pope* stil'd the *HEAD* of that Council, the *Successor* of S. *Peter*, *Prince* and *Head* of the Apostles; is not this a Contradiction, do you think, to your Pretences?

Answ. to Nub. Test. p. 34.

Div. This of the Council of *Ephesus* signifies *nothing at all*, but what the *Pope's Legate* said there signifies *much less*; since this is a Controversie not to be decided by what *This Pope*, or *That Legate* said: And therefore I pass it by.

Seek. And had you not as good have pass'd it by, without saying any thing at all? For tho' you say, *it signifies nothing*, what satisfaction is this to any one, who sees the very *thing in dispute* here thus *plainly acknowledg'd* in the very *Practice* of the *Council?* The *Pope's Power*, *Authority* and *Headship*, are positively here claim'd and express'd. Had the Fathers any ways oppos'd themselves, pretending all this to have been a *Usurpation*, a *Portentous Authority*, a *Groundless Supremacy*, as you do, you had certainly thought it much to your purpose; and do's it *signifie just nothing*, when so great an Assembly *owns* and *submits* to it? I am satisfi'd, had the *Fathers* there present been Men of your Church, they had never behav'd themselves in this manner. And however you make *nothing* of all this, yet I question not, there's enough in this Council, to convince any Thinking Man, that the Members of that August Assembly, were not acquainted with your Principles.

Counc. of Chalced.

Secondly, This Point is again clear'd in the Council of *Chalcedon*, the greatest of all the Councils, consisting of 630 Bishops, in which the Legates of Pope *Leo* Presided, as appears in

in his Letters to the Emperor and the Council; and this without any Conteſt, tho' in Preſence of *Dioſcorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, the Party chiefly concern'd, and of *Anatolius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*. Here then it was, that ſeveral Articles having been drawn up and prov'd againſt *Dioſcorus*, the Principal of which were; 1. *That he had forbid the Letters of Pope* Leo *to be read in the Synod of* Epheſus. 2. *That he had preſumptuouſly dar'd to Excommunicate the ſaid* Leo *Biſhop of* Rome.. 3. *That being thrice Summon'd, he refus'd to appear in the Synod. Paſchaſinus* one of the Pope's Legates made this Declaration to the Council, *Act.* 1. *We have in our Hands the Commands of the Bleſſed and Apoſtolic Prelate of the City of* Rome, *who is the* HEAD OF ALL CHURCHES, *wherein he has ordain'd, that* Dioſcorus *ſit not in Council; and that if he attempt it, he be caſt out.* After which the whole Matter being Diſcuſs'd, the Legates pronounc'd Sentence of Depoſition againſt him; and pray obſerve the Form: *Upon which Conſideration*, ſay they, *the moſt Holy and Bleſſed* Leo, *Archbiſhop of Great and Old* Rome, *by us, and by this Holy Synod here preſent, together with the moſt Bleſſed Apoſtle* Peter, *the Foundation and Top of the Catholic Church and Faith, has Depos'd him from his Epiſcopal Dignity, and likewiſe from any more performing the Function of Prieſt.* And this Sentence thus given by the Pope's Legates, was unanimouſly Subſcrib'd by all the Biſhops. Now don't you think, that in this manner of proceeding there's ſomething that ſpeaks the *Pope's Authority* to be very great, and even *Superior* to all other Patriarchs and Biſhops; while you ſee his Legates thus acting in ſo great a Council of the *Eaſtern* Church, without any Exception of the Fathers? Do's not this Practice clear the Matter under Debate, as much as any *Canon* of the *Code* could do? But this is not all; for the Emperor's Delegates did in preſence of this General Council declare, that according to former *Canons*, and the Depoſitions thence alledg'd, this Superior Power and Principal Charge, did belong to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as you may ſee in *l'Abbei* treating of this Council. And what is above all, this great Aſſembly of Fathers writ an excellent *Synodical Epiſtle* to Pope *Leo*, wherein they declar'd *Dioſcorus* to have been juſtly Depos'd, for having *furiouſly ſet himſelf againſt Him to whom*

the Care of the Vineyard was committed by Chriſt, that is, adds this Council, *Your Holineſs.* And then expreſly owning his Authority, they thus conclude: *You Preſided in this Council, as the* HEAD OVER THE MEMBERS, *ſhewing us your Goodneſs in thoſe who fill'd your Place; and the faithful Emperors Preſided there for Ornament or good Order.* Then they requeſted the Pope to Confirm what they had done: *We beſeech you* (ſays the Council to Pope *Leo*) *to honor our Judgment with your Decrees; and that as in what concerns the Weal, we have brought Correſpondency to our* HEAD, *ſo your Superiority will perform in the behalf of your* CHILDREN *that which is fitting.*

Anſw. to Nub. Teſt. p. 34. *Div.* What Pope *Leo*'s Legat ſaid in this Council of *Chalcedon*, as likewiſe this little Paſſage of this Council, is of no ſtrength.

Seek. Why then, I ſee, nothing is like to be of any ſtrength, that is againſt you; and I may conclude all farther Enquiry in your Company, to be to little purpoſe: In this very Council, is in a manner poſitively decided all our Controverſie. The Pope's *Power is moſt ſolemnly own'd*; He is confeſs'd to *Preſide as Head over the Members*; *To his Charge they acknowledge the* CARE OF THE VINEYARD *to be committed by Chriſt.* And pray, what more than this do's the Council of *Florence* aſſert of the *Pope?* All that is there *expreſs'd*, is here *imply'd*: and yet *this is of no ſtrength.* For my part, whatſoever you may think, I take this *Practice*, *Acknowledgments*, and *Manner of Proceeding* in this Council, to eſtabliſh as firmly, and deliver as plainly, to any unprejudic'd Man, the *Prerogative* of the *Roman Chair*, as if deliver'd in the *Canons* of the *Code.* And yet you are pleas'd to paſs it all by, and at the ſame time to call this a *Groundleſs Supremacy*, whereof no Foot-ſteps can be found in the *Firſt Six Centuries.*

I need not proceed farther upon this Subject, yet I cannot paſs by the *Fifth General Council* aſſembled at *Conſtantinople*: In which 'tis very remarkable, how *Eutychius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* acknowledg'd this *Right* of the Pope's *Preſiding* in General Councils, in a Letter directed to *Vigilius* then Biſhop of *Rome*, in which he addreſſes himſelf to him in theſe words: *'Tis neceſſary*, ſays he, *the Point of the* Tria Capitula *ſhould be*

now

now Discuss'd, which has been the Subject of great Debates: For this reason we request, YOUR HOLINESS PRESIDING OVER US, that these Articles be enquir'd into with a Moderation and Meekness becoming Priests, the Holy Gospels being propos'd, that so a Period may be put to this Controversie, acceptable to God, and consonant to what has been Defin'd in the Four Holy Councils. Which Address of this *Patriarch* to the *Pope* is the more remarkable, inasmuch as it was sent to him, at a time, when the *Pope* could expect nothing of *Favor* from the *Eastern Bishops*, he having oppos'd himself against the Proceedings of their Emperor *Justinian*, and in some manner espous'd a Cause not very agreeable to their Inclinations; and yet at this time to hear a *Patriarch* of the *East* thus positively confessing this *Prerogative* of the Bishop of *Rome*, and owning his *Superiority*, which nothing of *Affection*, but only *Justice* could move him to, I take to be a very pregnant Argument of the *Judgment* and *Practice* in the *Fathers* of those Times. Which is again farther evinc'd in this Council, in which tho' the *Pope* was not present either by himself or his Legates, yet the *Fathers* did there acknowledge, that the more *Weighty Concerns* of the Church ought to be referr'd to him: as in the Case of *Theodore* Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, which, with Approbation of the Council, was remitted to the *Pope*, and the Reason there alledg'd is, *Cum Primam inter Sacerdotes Dignitatem sortiti estis*; *Because He was the First in Dignity among all other Priests.* This Behavior of these *Eastern Bishops* assembled under their *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, to me seems very prevalent, since I am satisfi'd, *Eutychius* would never have own'd in him the *Right* of *Presiding*, or the Synod remitted the Concerns of their Church to his Consideration, had it not in *Justice*, and according to the *receiv'd Practice* of the Church belong'd to him. Hitherto of *Presiding* in Councils.

Now I'll in short give you a Sum of some other particular *Prerogatives* belonging to the *See of Rome*, which I have observ'd in the perusal of some Authors treating of this Subject. And *First*, what was hinted before, of no *Acts of Councils* being judg'd *Valid*, which were concluded on without the Consent of the Bishop of *Rome*. And in this *Socrates*, tho' an Enemy to the See of *Rome*, is very express; who says, *That* *Socrat. l. 2.*

there was an Eccleſiaſtical Canon forbidding the Churches to be rul'd without the Approbation of the Biſhop of Rome; and this ſpeaking of the Decrees of an *Eaſtern Synod at Antioch*. Which Synod likewiſe *Sozomen* accuſes of *Tranſgreſſing the Laws of the Church, in not calling the Pope to the Council, without whoſe Approbation nothing could be Valid, according to the Law of the Church*: For *that the CARE OF ALL did belong to him, for the Dignity of his See*. This again is moſt clear in the Information brought in againſt *Dioſcorus* by *Lucentius* the Pope's Legate, in the Council of *Chalcedon*; in which one Article was, *That not having Authority to Judge, he notwithſtanding preſum'd to call a Synod without the Authority of the See Apoſtolic, which was ever unlawful, and without Precedent*. This Charge thus allow'd of without Conteſt in an *Eaſtern Council*, together with the concurring Teſtimonies of other Authors and Hiſtorians, is of no ſmall force in this Point. And what think you of the Relation given by *Amianus Marcellinus* a Pagan Author, concerning the Emperor *Conſtantius*, who reſolving to ſecure the Condemnation of *Athanaſius*, and put it beyond queſtion, was not ſatisfi'd, that he had been Depos'd in a Council of 300 Biſhops, but earneſtly ſolicited Pope *Liberius* to confirm the Condemnation: *Altho'*, ſaid he, *the Emperor knew this was done, yet he ſolicited with an earneſt deſire, that it might be confirm'd by the Authority, whereof the Biſhops of the Eternal City are Superiors*. Something of this Authority is again expreſs'd in the *Weſtern Synod* under Pope *Damaſus*, which declar'd the Council of *Ariminum*, how great ſoever, to be Invalid, becauſe Pope *Liberius*, whoſe Judgment was firſt of all to be attended, had never conſented to it, nor *Vincentius* Biſhop of *Capua*, &c. *The number of Biſhops*, ſays this Synod, *aſſembled at* Ariminum, *ought to make no Prevarication*; *ſince this Confeſſion was compos'd without the Conſent of the Biſhop of* Rome, *whoſe Sentence ſhould be attended before all others*; *or that of* Vincentius, *who had for ſo many years worthily Adminiſtred the Biſhop's See, &c.* And I think the Profeſſion of the Emperor *Juſtinian*, in the Law to *Epiphanius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, do's moſt fully ſhew the Practice of the Church in thoſe Times, and ſet this Point beyond all doubt: *We preſerve*, ſays he, *the State of the Unity of the moſt Holy Churches in all things, with the moſt Holy*

Soz. l. 3. c. 9.

Am. Marcel. l. 15.

Tit. 1. l. 7.

Holy Pope of Old Rome, *to whom we have written the like; becauſe we will not ſuffer any thing to paſs concerning the Affairs of the Church, which ſhall not be alſo referr'd to his Holineſs, foraſmuch as he is the* HEAD *of* ALL *the Holy Prelates of God.* And the ſame he repeats again: *We will not ſuffer,* ſays he, *that any thing ſhall be treated of belonging to the State of the Churches, tho' clear and manifeſt, which ſhall not alſo be referr'd to your Holineſs, who are the* HEAD *of* ALL *the Churches.* *Cod. tit.* 1. *l.* 8.

Secondly, As to the *Pope's Power of Excommunicating or Confirming Biſhops* in any part of the World, that is a moſt remarkable Inſtance of Pope *Victor*, even in the very Second Century, who threatned Excommunication to the *Aſian Biſhops*, for their Diſagreement in the obſerving of *Eaſter*. *Euſ. Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 24.

Div, And was not this *Pope* moſt ſeverely check'd by ſeveral other Biſhops for this irregular Action? The Behavior of theſe Biſhops towards his Holineſs, do's not very clearly prove his *Supremacy*: and this would certainly have been very *unaccountable Carriage* towards *Chriſt's True Vicar*, who had *full Power of Governing the whole Church:* The truth is, they knew of no ſuch Perſon in thoſe days, he was not born into the World till near a Thouſand years after them. *Anſw. to Nub. Teſt. p.* 25.

Seek. 'Tis true, *Irenæus* (as *Euſebius* relates it, *ib.*) *did fitly exhort Pope* Victor, *not wholly to cut off from the Body of the Univerſal Church, ſo many Dioceſes, for the Obſervance of a Tradition, which had been anciently practis'd amongſt them.* But who do's not perceive in this a plain Deciſion of this Matter; ſince, as 'tis evident, *Irenæus* do's not there reprehend the *Pope* for *want* of *Power*; but only adviſes him, not to make an *ill uſe* of it? 'Tis plain indeed, that *Irenæus* did not approve of the doing it, not judging that a ſufficient ground for paſſing the Excommunication. But ſince *Irenæus* do's not object to him, that he could not Excommunicate the *Aſians*; but only admoniſhes him, that for ſo ſmall a Cauſe he ought not to cut off ſo many Provinces from the Body of the Church; 'tis evident, I think, that *Irenæus* acknowledg'd *this Power* in the Biſhop of *Rome*, tho' he did not judge that a ſufficient Reaſon.

Another Inſtance is that of Pope *Innocent*, who hearing of the Death of St. *John Chryſoſtom*, which had been untimely brought

brought upon him by the Malice of his Adverſaries, and the Aſſiſtance of the Emperor and Empreſs of the *Eaſt*; did, upon receiving the News, Excommunicate *Arcadius* and *Eudoxia*, in theſe words, as 'tis related by *George* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and follow'd by *Cedrenus* and others: *And therefore I the meaneſt, and a Sinner, as Depoſitary of the Throne of the great Apoſtle* Peter, *cut off Thee and Her from the Participation of the Immaculate Myſteries of Chriſt our God; and ordain, that whatſoever Biſhop or Clerk of the Holy Church of God, which ſhall preſume to Adminiſter them to you, after he has read this my Order, ſhall be Depos'd.* Here is this Cenſure pronounc'd againſt the Emperor and Empreſs of the *Eaſt*, about the Year 400, by the Biſhop of *Rome*, in virtue of the *Apoſtolic See*; and likewiſe *Depoſition* threatned to all Biſhops or Prieſts whatſoever, that ſhould preſume to diſobey his Precept, which do's evidently imply them all to be under his *Charge* and *Authority*. The ſame Biſhop of *Rome* Excommunicated likewiſe, upon the ſame occaſion, *Alexander* Patriarch of *Antioch*, and *Atticus* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; neither would he receive them into Communion, till they had comply'd with all the Conditions propos'd, and inſerted S. *Chryſoſtom*'s Name into the Records of the Church, as appears in his Letter to *Alexander*, Epiſt. 17. 'Twould be endleſs to give you a Catalogue of what has been done in this kind in the *Primitive Church*: I'll only put you in mind of the other Branch of this Power; as in the Caſe of the falſe Synod of *Epheſus*, mention'd in the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Act* 3. where *Paſchaſinus* the Pope's Legate declar'd: *That the Pope had pardon'd all thoſe, who in the falſe Council of* Epheſus, *had by force conſented to Dioſcorus*, that is, almoſt all the *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs* of the *Eaſt*. *The Apoſtolic See*, ſays he, *grants them pardon for thoſe things*. And when the Acts of this *Epheſin* Synod were annull'd in the Council of *Chalcedon*, is it not a thing of weight, that *Anatolius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* declar'd all that had been done in that Synod to be *Void*, excepting only the Election of *Maximus* to the See of *Antioch*, becauſe this had been confirm'd by the Pope. *Foraſmuch*, ſays he, *that the moſt Holy Archbiſhop of* Rome, Leo, *receiving him into Communion, has judg'd, that he ought to Rule the Church of* Antioch, *ib. Act.* 10.

I'll

I'll not stay longer in giving more Particulars of this kind, which are so frequent in all the Histories of those First Ages of the Church; I'll content my self with producing in short some other Footsteps of this *Supremacy* within the Bounds to which you challenge, and so conclude.

And *First*, The Answer which Pope *Innocent* above mention'd, gave to the Synods of *Carthage* and *Milevis*, who apply'd themselves to him for his *Approbation* and *Assistance*, I take to be an undeniable Proof of the *Practice* of that and the foregoing Ages: but especially his Answer to the *Milevitan* Council: *It was not by Human, but Divine Sentence*, says this Pope, *that the Fathers have ordain'd, that all things that are treated in Provinces distant, should not be determin'd, till first they were come to the knowledge of the See Apostolic; to the end that the Sentence, that should be found just, might be Confirm'd by the Entire Authority of the same See; and that from thence the other Churches, as Springs flowing from their Mother Source, and running with the Purity of their Original, thro' the divers Regions of the whole World, might take what they ought to ordain.* And again: *You provide*, says he, *diligently and worthily for the Apostolic Honor, for the Honor, I say, of Him, who, besides Assaults from without,* SUSTAINS THE CARE OF ALL THE CHURCHES; *following in the Consultation of difficult things, the Form of the* ANCIENT RULE, *which, you know, has always been practis'd by* ALL THE WORLD *with me.* Both these Answers are inserted amongst St. *Augustin*'s Epistles, and are cited by St. *Augustin* himself against the *Pelagians*. *Epist.* 91, 93. And to take off all Objections that might be made against this, of it being nothing but the Judgment of a *Pope* in his own Cause, St. *Augustin* is very positive in Approving and Commending these Answers, as appears in his Epistles; where giving an account of what had pass'd in this Affair, he says. *Upon this matter, the Relations of the Two Councils of* Carthage *and* Milevis *were sent to the Apostolic See*, &c. *To all these things Pope* Innocent *answer'd us as was convenient, and as the Prelate of the Apostolic See should answer us.* In which Epistle St. *Augustin* is so far from reproaching Pope *Innocent*, as if pretending to an Usurp'd Authority, whilst he claims a Right of giving *Force* to whatsoever was to be Determin'd for *Epist.* 157.

the

the Church even in remote Provinces, whilst he declares the See of *Rome* for the *Mother Church*, the *Head* on which depended *all other Regions* of the World for the Receiving the *Purity* of their Ordinances; That *He*, in that Dignity of the Apostolic See, *Sustain'd the Care of all* CHURCHES; That the *Consulting Him in difficult Matters, was the Ancient Rule, and what the whole World then Practis'd*: He is so far, I say, from reproching Pope *Innocent*, for assuming too much to himself in these Points, that he acknowledges and approves it all, in confessing the *Pope* to have writ nothing in his Answer to these Councils, but what the *Prelate of the Apostolic See ought to have answer'd*: which to me seems to include all that is in other terms only declar'd in the Council of *Florence*.

Secondly, The Universal Authority of the Bishop of *Rome* is plainly seen again, and acknowledg'd in the Case of *Hilary* Bishop of *Arles*, who undertook to make Prelates in the Province of *Vienna*, without the *Pope*'s leave; upon which *Valentinian* III. made this Law, which was afterwards inserted by *Theodosius* II. into his Constitutions: *Whereas the Merit of* Peter, says the Law, *who is the Prince of the Episcopal Society, and the Dignity of the City of* Rome, *and the Authority of the Sacred Synod have so establish'd the* PRIMACY *of the Apostolic See; as Presumption should attempt nothing unlawful against the Authority thereof: for so the Peace of Churches shall be maintain'd by* ALL, *if the* UNIVERSALITY *acknowledge her* RECTOR. And then, *We Decree by a Perpetual Ordinance, that it shall not be lawful, either for the Bishops of the* Gauls, *or those of other Provinces, to attempt any thing against the* ANCIENT CUSTOM, *without the Authority of the Reverend Pope of the Eternal City: But to them and to* ALL, *those things shall be Laws, which have been ordain'd by the Authority of the Apostolic See, in such sort, as whatsoever Bishop, being call'd to the Judgment of the Pope of* Rome, *shall neglect to present himself, he shall be constrain'd by the Governor of the Province to appear.* Here is a *Primacy* asserted in the Bishop of *Rome*, and that not of *Order* only, which is all you'll allow him, but of *Authority* too; so that whatsoever has been Constituted by that *See*, shall be a *Law* to *All*, and nothing be attempted without the Consent of that Bishop: And this not newly introduc'd by

Const. Novel. Theod. & Valent. tit. 24.

by this Emperor, but ordain'd according to the *Ancient Custom*; which being thus declar'd before the Year 450, the time of the Fourth General Council, do's clearly imply, that this had been the *Practice* of the *Church*, even in the very first Ages, tho' it was at this time, upon the occasion of this attempt of *Hilary*, made into a *Law* of the *State*, and confirm'd by the *Temporal Power*. And by the way, here you may observe, that this *Authority* of the Bishop of *Rome*, was not founded only upon his Residence in the *Imperial City*, as you pretend; but besides, upon the *Merits of Peter* the Prince of Bishops, and upon the *Decrees of a Sacred Synod*; as 'tis here declar'd in this Edict, publish'd within the time to which you challenge. And withal, pray remember, that *Hilary*, convinc'd of the Irregularity of his proceedings, went afterwards to *Rome* on foot, presented himself to Pope *Leo*, *reverently offering him Obedience, and appeasing his Spirit with a prostrate Humility*, as 'tis related by the Author of his Life in *Cujas*.

Thirdly, This Universal Charge of the Bishop of *Rome* is apparent in Pope *Leo*'s Letter to *Anastasius* Bishop of *Thessalonica*, and his Vicar in *Macedonia* and other Provinces of *Greece*, who having abus'd the Authority of his Vicarship, was thus writ to by the Pope: *We have in such sort committed our Vicarship to thy Charity, as thou art call'd to a Part of the Care, and not to the Fullness of the Power.* And then afterwards: *It has been provided by a Grand Order, that all should not attribute to themselves all things; but that in every Province there should be some, whose Sentence might hold the first Place: and again, that some others constituted in the greater Cities, might use the more diligence, that by them the Care of the* UNIVERSAL CHURCH MIGHT FLOW TO THE ONLY SEAT OF PETER. Here is again expres'd the *Universal Pastorship of the Bishop of Rome*, and this provided by a *Grand Order*, which must, without doubt, be the *Canons*, or *Decrees* of Councils. Add to this the Confession of the *Eastern Bishops* to Pope *Symmachus*, in their Letter concerning *Acacius*: *A Sacro Petro doceris oves Christi per totum mundum tibi creditas pascere*; *Thou art taught by* Peter *to feed the Sheep of Christ, which are committed to* THY CARE THROUGHOUT *Epist.* 82.

THE WHOLE WORLD. Thus writ the *Eastern Bishops* to the *Pope*, within the time to which you challenge, and expresly own'd him, the *Universal Pastor*. The same is declar'd by the Bishop of *Patara* in *Lycia*, who seeing *Justinian* persecuting Pope *Sylverius* at the instance of the Empress an *Eutychian*, us'd his Endeavors to dissuade him from it. *He represented to him* (says *Liberatus* an Historian of the same Age) *the Judgment of God upon the Expulsion of the Bishop of so great a See; admonishing him, that there were many Kings in the World, but there was not one of them as the Pope, who was* OVER THE CHURCH OF THE WHOLE WORLD, *who had been dispossess'd of his See.* The like is confirm'd by S. *Gregory* the Great, in the Case of *Clementius* Primate in *Africa*, who having been accus'd before the Emperor, and remitted by him to the See Apostolic, St. *Gregory* upon this occasion thus writes: *If there be any Fault in the Bishops, I know not what Bishop is not subject to the See Apostolic; if a Fault require it not, according to the reason of Humility, we are all equal.*

Lib. in Brev. Caus. Nest. & Eutych. c. 22.

Now, if we consider what has been hitherto acknowledg'd concerning the *Authority* of the Bishop of *Rome* above all other Bishops; how *General Councils* have own'd him their HEAD; That he *Presided* over them, as the *Head over the Members*; That in such an Assembly he has been solemnly styl'd the HEAD of ALL *Churches*; That the same has declar'd, that to *Him the Care of the Vineyard was committed by Christ*. How the Holy Fathers have acknowledg'd, that the *Bishop of* Rome *sustains the Care of all the Churches*; That 'twas the *Ancient Rule*, that *All the World* should consult the Bishop of *Rome* in difficult Matters relating to the Church. How *Emperor*'s have by *Laws* declar'd his *Authority* to be *Universal*; and that for the keeping of Peace the *Universality ought to acknowledge him Rector*. How *Historians*, tho' no Friends to the *Pope*, have deliver'd it, *That the Care of All did belong to him*. How the Bishops of the *East* have confess'd, *That the Flock of Christ, throughout the whole World, was committed to his Care*. How Prelates, from all Parts of the World, have *Appeal'd* to him, and desir'd his Assistance against the Attempts of their Adversaries. How *General Councils* have confirm'd and acknowledg'd this his Authority even in the

the *Pureſt Ages* of the Church. How from his *See*, *Laws* were given to the *Churches*; *Councils Confirm'd* by him; *Decrees Annull'd*, *Offenders Cenſur'd* and *Excommunicated*, *Cauſes Determin'd*, and this Authority ſupported by *Canons* and the *Decrees* of Councils, as *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Gelaſius*, *Valentinian*, &c. expreſly declare. How that by the Law of *Juſtinian* he was acknowledg'd the HEAD OF ALL THE HOLY PRELATES OF GOD, and the HEAD OF ALL THE CHURCHES, *&c.* If we conſider, I ſay, and reflect on this, there's a neceſſity of conceiving his *Authority Superior* to that of all *other Biſhops* and *Patriarchs*; and that *his See* is endow'd with a *Singular Prerogative* juſtly call'd a *Supremacy*; and conſequently, that there's nothing Defin'd in the Council of *Florence*, but what the Practice of the *Primitive Church* doth declare as expreſly as the *Canon* of that Synod: For have we not now ſeen in theſe Firſt Ages, the Biſhop of *Rome* acknowledg'd the Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, Prince of the Apoſtles? Have we not heard it own'd, that to him the *Care of the Vineyard was committed by Chriſt?* And is not this to be *True Vicar of Chriſt?* Have we not found him confeſs'd the *Head of all Churches*, *the Head of all Prelates*; *and that he ſuſtains the Care of all*; And is not this the ſame as to be *Head of the whole Church*, *the Father and Doctor of all Chriſtians?* Have we not heard, that the *Care of the Flock of Chriſt was committed to him?* And is not this to have *full Power of Feeding*, *Ruling and Governing the whole Church?* So that almoſt in very *Terms* we have the Definition of *Florence* concerning the *Pope's Supremacy*, in the *Confeſſion* and *Practice* of the *Primitive Church*. And yet you are pleas'd to call it an *Uſurpation*, a *Portentous Authority*, a *Groundleſs Supremacy*. For my part, you may ſay what you pleaſe, but if this *Authority be Groundleſs*, then I am ſatisfi'd, there's no Point or Practice of Chriſtianity, but what may be ſuſpected; there being no one Point Confirm'd by more undeniable Inſtances, and fuller Teſtimonies of Antiquity, than this. And if in your Opinion, the Exceptions you make, borrowed from the Adverſaries of that Chair, be ſufficient to overthrow it, 'tis but turning your Pen againſt the *B. Trinity*, *Incarnation*, &c. and borrowing the like Arguments from the *Eutychians*, *Neſtorians*, *Arians*, *Socinians*, &c. and 'tis likely

likely within a while you may arrive to that Perfection, as to think them all in a condition of falling together. For I don't see any thing you object here, but a little Enquiry will furnish any one with the like Cavils against these most Fundamental Points of Christianity. And therefore if this be all you have to oppose against the Bishop of *Rome*, I may ee'n take my leave of you; for I see you are only like to prevail upon those, who are wrought upon by *Hard Words*, and *Magisterial Slightings*. This won't do with me, and therefore I must ee'n seek out for a better Guide; and so farewel.

FINIS.
